

SOME REMARKS ON ELLIPSIS IN POLISH AND ENGLISH¹

TIM SHOPEN

Center for Applied Linguistics, Arlington

and

WALERIAN ŚWIECZKOWSKI

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin

1. *A command of ellipsis is part of knowing a language*

... [Karras] Felt for the pulse. And in a wrenching stabbing instance of anguish, Karras realized that Merrin was dead... Then he saw the tiny pills scattered loose on the floor. He picked one up and with aching recognition saw that Merrin had known. Nitroglycerin. He'd known. His eyes red and brimming, Karras looked at Merrin's face... (Blatty 1972: 388).

In the sequence "...Merrin had known. Nitroglycerin.", any reader that recognizes nitroglycerin as a medicine for severe heart conditions will infer that *Merrin had known that he had a severe heart condition and that he might die from it*. And this is just the inference the author intends us to make.

Presented with such a passage, a transformational grammarian might claim that the clause *Merrin had known* had a deep structure that included a further embedding, *that he had a severe heart condition and might die from it*, and that there was a transformation that eliminated it from the surface structure, an optional rule that deleted the object of *known* in the presence of the noun *nitroglycerin*, provided that the object contained an assertion about heart conditions.

¹ A revised version of the paper presented at the sixth international conference on contrastive linguistics (Kazimierz, 1974). The authors are grateful to the many people at the conference who gave helpful comments, particularly to Nina Nowakowska, and most of all to Wayles Browne. Those who read the preliminary version can recognize how much the dialogue has helped us.

The Nitroglycerin Deletion Rule (optional)

SD:	<i>X know</i>	S	<i>X nitroglycerin X</i>
	1	2	3
SC:	1	0	3

Condition: 2 contains an assertion about severe heart conditions.

As an alternative to this approach, we will say that what it is that Merrin had known is not specified in the grammatical structure at any level, and that part of the power of this passage is that the author has left some work for the imagination of the reader. Indeed, he does not leave room for any more than one interpretation, but at the same time he has encoded only part of his idea into linguistic form. From this point of view there is a distinction between what is entailed by a grammatical structure and what is inferred from it (cf. Bolinger 1971 and Kirsner 1972).

Merrin had known meets the definition of ellipsis given by Shopen (1973) in that only part of a proposition is encoded into linguistic form: the propositional head *know* is present without a constituent to represent one of its arguments. Referring to the notion of propositional structure with a hierarchy of predicates and arguments, we can distinguish two kinds of ellipsis, *functional ellipsis* with constituents serving as arguments without a predicate to govern them, as can be the interpretation for the noun *plaszcz* (coat) in the Polish dialogue:

Jacek!
Co?
Plaszcz.
Dobra jest.

(Jacek! What? The coat. All right.)

and *constituent ellipsis* where a predicate is expressed without all its arguments, as in *Merrin had known* above, or in the Polish expression *on się nie zgadza* (he does not agree), as in the dialogue:

Co się stało?
On się nie zgadza.
No to co?

(What happened? He does not agree. So what?)

Examples of this sort abound in the most natural use of language in any culture. People who speak and write a language well do not want to bother their audience with information they already have or that they can find out easily for themselves; in addition, it is sometimes preferable to leave thoughts in one piece rather than to analyze and break them down to the level of word meanings.

Ellipsis is rule governed. Knowing when it is possible and appropriate

to leave parts of a proposition out of an utterance is an important aspect of knowing the language; the relevance for the theories of language acquisition and second language learning is obvious.

Constituent ellipsis is allowed with some verbs, but not others (in non-anaphoric ellipsis):

POLISH	ENGLISH
On zrozumiał.	He understood.
*On oczekiwał.	*He expected.

Parts of speech in morphologically related words differ in their capacity for ellipsis. There is a general tendency for nouns and adjectives to allow more ellipsis of their arguments than verbs.

ENGLISH

The family is in financial straits because

*John wastes. (VERB)

John is wasteful. (ADJECTIVE)

POLISH

Rodzina ma kłopoty finansowe.
(Family) has problems financial

*ponieważ Jacek marnuje. (VERB)
because Jacek wastes.

z powodu marnotrawstwa Jacek (NOUN)
because of wastefulness of Jacek).

In answers to yes-no question, Polish and English differ in the possibilities for ellipsis. Note that in contrast to the examples just above, we enter here into the area of anaphoric ellipsis, that is, ellipsis where there is linguistic context providing an antecedent. In English, auxiliary verbs may be used freely to stand for a whole verb phrase².

Has John been spending all his money on flowers for his girl again?
Yes, he has.

In Polish, you would generally just say *Tak* (Yes) in a situation like this, or else give an answer that repeats the main verb. First of all, Polish has fewer

² We would classify this as constituent ellipsis, though nothing hinges on this distinction here. Cf. Morgan 1973, for an interesting discussion of short answers to questions in English. Morgan develops arguments in favor of deletion rules as a means of deriving short answers. His position is not directly in opposition to ours since we have argued against the use of deletion rules in nonanaphoric ellipsis (cf. Shopen 1973). It is nevertheless our belief that it will be possible to rule out deletion rules from the theory of syntax altogether.

auxiliary verbs; moreover, except for modals, Polish auxiliary verb (*być*, *zostać*) cannot stand alone in answers of this kind.

Czy Jan został aresztowany?
(Has John been arrested?)

Tak.	(Yes.)
*Tak, on został.	(Yes, he has.)
Tak, on został aresztowany.	(Yes, he has been arrested.)

On the other hand, ellipsis of objects is common in Polish answers in a way that is not possible in English. In non-anaphoric ellipsis, neither the Polish verb *pożyczyć*, nor its English equivalent *lend* allow ellipsis of a direct object.

Czy był on hojny?
*Tak, on pożyczył.

Was he generous?
*Yes, he lent.

In the anaphora of a question and answer dialogue, however, where the same verb is used in both sentences, Polish allows object ellipsis with any verb, even with verbs where it would not otherwise be permissible, e.g. *pożyczyć* again.

Czy on pożyczył pieniądze?
Tak, (on) pożyczył.

Did he lend the money?
*Yes, he lent.

Of course, the short answer *Yes, he did* is available in English, where the main verb is avoided altogether, and thus the object of that verb as well. For various reasons, we believe that the Polish answer with the main verb, *Tak, (on) pożyczył*, and the English *Yes, he did* are not equivalent to each other, either semantically or stylistically, so that altogether short answers in Polish and English appear to us as different systems, which merit special attention in teaching situations.

It is important to realize that the object ellipsis noted above in Polish is a special feature of short answers where the same verb has been used in the question. It is *not* simply a matter of whether an antecedent is present for the ellipsed object. If the same verb is not present in both the question and the answer, the usual constraints on object ellipsis apply. Compare:

Czy dostali pieniądze?
*Tak, (on) pożyczył.
Tak, on je pożyczył.

(Did they get the money? Yes, he lent it (to them).)

2. The scope of contrastive analysis studies

It seems to us that contrastive analysis of languages can be viewed from two perspectives, the most basic one limited to grammatical description, and the second, one that includes grammatical description, but also the notion of style and language as a means of communicating ideas. In the first, contrastive analysis is related most significantly to a universal theory of grammar and to language typology; the second can hope to make a contribution to language teaching.

It is our view that ellipsis has special relevance to grammatical theory in that it is an important aspect of the grammatical structure of languages and also because there are important consequences for the grammatical model when one includes a systematic account of the shorter things that people say as well as the larger ones. There are in particular important consequences for how context-sensitive constraints can be defined in the generative model (cf. Shopen 1972b, and forthcoming). Our position is that non-anaphoric ellipsis—that is to say, ellipsis without any linguistic context to fill the parts of propositions that have been left out—does not *come from* a non-elliptical source, but rather should be generated directly in the base component of a generative grammar. Thus, when somebody says *kawa* (coffee) as the sole means of conveying a message, the extent to which grammatical knowledge is involved has to do with the noun phrase *kawa* and no more. For the rest of the message, some other kind of cognition takes over.

A second language teacher is concerned with teaching how to encode ideas into linguistic form with a new grammatical system, and perhaps with some of the style or appropriateness practiced in the culture from which the language comes. If we are correct that ellipsis represents a distinct way of encoding ideas into grammatical form, then ellipsis has special relevance. To the extent that the native language and the target language have the same grammar of ellipsis, they may still have different stylistic conventions for the use of ellipsis. And, of course, the grammatical possibilities for ellipsis can be different as well. The grammatical study is primary, because the notion of style is meaningful only when it is clear what possible range of choices are allowed by grammar.

3. The grammatical analysis of ellipsis

3.1 The distinction between entailment and inference

If elliptical constructions are thought of as remnants of non-elliptical constructions that have undergone deletion rules, then their form and meaning can be said to be accounted for in the analysis of non-elliptical utterances. In our view, however, elliptical utterances deserve status in the grammar

in their own right since they have distinctive syntactic and semantic properties.

While the study of context is of great interest in its own terms, a central concern in linguistic research has been and must remain the characterization of the grammatical properties of utterances independently of the contexts in which they are used. Without knowing them in advance, human beings can communicate in a potentially infinite number of contexts, and with a finite amount of knowledge. From this it follows that words and larger structures must have conventional meanings that they carry with them wherever they go. These are the grammatically determined, entailed meanings, as opposed to the parts of messages that are inferred in specific contexts. It is just in this respect that the principle of recoverability of deletions (Katz and Postal 1964) is important. In the kind of ellipsis that we are discussing here, the speaker relies on shared knowledge and perception of context for the completion of the intended message. In terms of their grammatical properties, *Plaszcz* (The coat), or *On się nie zgadza* (He does not agree) can convey a potentially infinite number of messages. The criterion of recoverability correctly prevents us from deriving these utterances from non-elliptical sources by deletion rules.

The grammatical analysis of ellipsis then should be concerned with syntactic and semantic properties of the construction that actually appear in utterances. We know that *On się nie zgadza* is elliptical, because of the meaning of *zgadzać się* (to agree). We know that *Plaszcz* expresses an incomplete proposition because it has the form of a noun phrase.

Noun phrases must always be interpreted as subparts of propositions even when they have the same propositional content as sentences. Compare *Tata powrócił* (The father returned) and *Powrót taty* (The return of the father). The sentence *Tata powrócił* can stand alone and have independence (cf. Jespersen 1924: 305ff.) in the sense that its propositional content can carry the illocutionary force of a statement or a report. Not so for the noun phrase *Powrót taty*: its propositional content can only be interpreted as a subpart of some larger proposition, and only this larger proposition can carry illocutionary force and constitute a message, for example, the noun phrase answers a question such as *Co uszczęśliwiło dzieci?* (What made the children happy?), or it serves as a title for a ballad³.

³ It is because of their distinct semantic properties that there is a tendency to use noun phrases for titles in a number of European languages (cf. Kruppik 1970; Rywacki 1973; cf. Shopen 1973 for a discussion of the semantics of titles). Note that this practice is not universal. In Bambara, a language spoken widely in West Africa, there is a tradition of using sentences for the titles of songs and poems much in the manner of „Szła dziewczeczka do laseczka”.

3.2 Obligatory ellipsis

Once one concentrates on the analysis of the words that actually appear in elliptical utterances, a number of interesting problems emerge. While constituent ellipsis is sometimes disallowed by grammar, e.g. **Tomek zganil* (Tom blamed), there are other cases where it is compulsory. Compare the Polish verbs *przemienić się* (to change) and *stać się* (to become). The semantic structure of *przemienić się* (to change) can be said to be characterized by a three-place predicate CHANGE, where by convention the first argument (x) is the THEME, or entity that changes from one state or location to another, the second (y) is the SOURCE, or the starting point for the change, and the third (z) is the GOAL, or end point of the change (cf. Gruber 1965).

	[CHANGE x y z]		
Książę	przemienił się	z żaby	w poczwara.
x		y	z
(The prince	changed	from a frog	into a monster.)

It is possible for the SOURCE state to be named in the subject position:

Żaba	przemieniła się	w poczwara.
xy		z
(The frog	changed	into a monster.)

The lexical entry for the verb *przemienić się* (to change) can then capture the possible correspondences between syntactic constituents and semantic functions.

<i>przemienić się</i>	
[[NP _____ (PP) (PP)]
x	y z
[NP _____ (PP)]	
xy	z
]	[CHANGE x y z] Abstract change of state.]

If one chooses to express the same concepts with the verb *stać się* (to become), the possibilities for syntactic expression are more limited. Speaking of the same situation, one could say:

Książę	stał się	poczwara
(The prince	became	a monster,

but not

*Książę	stał się	z żaby	poczwara
(The prince	became	from a frog	(to) a monster.)

One can express the SOURCE in subject position, but not in the verb phrase. As the first approximation, the lexical entry for *stać się* (to become) might be presented as follows:

stać się

[NP	_____	NP]
x(y)	z	
[CHANGE x y z] abstract change of state.]		

3.3 Musical chairs

Constituent ellipsis of a different sort is represented by what Shopen (1973) calls the Musical Chair Phenomenon. This occurs when a propositional head, such as a verb, governs a certain number of arguments, all of which can be syntactically, but not all at once within an ordinary simplex clause. Consider the Polish counterpart to Shopen's example with *explain*. The concept of an explanation includes the notion of a problem as well as the explanation of that problem, but it is not possible to express both of these elements freely with separate constituents in an ordinary simplex clause.

Uczeń (The student)	wyjaśnił explained	nauczycielce to his teacher	swą nieobecność. his absence.)
Uczeń (The student)	wyjaśnił explained	nauczycielce, to his teacher	że był chory that he had been ill).
*Uczeń (The student)	wyjaśnił explained	nauczycielce to his teacher	swą nieobecność, his absence że był chory. that he had been ill.)

It is striking that equivalents of the verb *to explain* in a number of languages, including Polish and Chinese, appear to have the same Musical Chair property. It is unlikely that this is an arbitrary syntactic restriction. It seems rather that the concept of an explanation is in some way 'multi-dimensional' for the speakers of the language, so that not all of the arguments can be expressed simultaneously within an ordinary simplex clause. Special syntactic devices, however, can be employed to get all the arguments on, for example, a preposed prepositional phrase that topicalizes one of the arguments or a subordinate clause employing an additional verb, as

Jeśli chodzi o jego nieobecność, (As regards his absence)	uczeń the student	wyjaśnił explained	
	nauczycielce, to his teacher	że był chory. that he had been ill.	
Uczeń (The student)	wyjaśnił explained	nauczycielce to his teacher	swą nieobecność his absence mówiąc jej, że był chory. by saying that he had been ill.)

Both these Polish examples involve a major break in the intonation contour of the utterance. It would be reasonable to say that these are not just simplex clauses, but simplex clauses plus adjuncts. Somewhat unidiomatically, it is also possible to use the pronoun *tym* in the instrumental case, before a pause, and then have a subordinate clause follow the pause in apposition to the pronoun:

Uczeń (The student)	wyjaśnił explained	nauczycielce to his teacher	swą nieobecność his absence
	tym, by this,	że był chory. that he was ill.	

Finally, we should note that the example we have presented allows a paraphrase of marginal acceptability, but with a single intonation contour, with all arguments included. The device that makes it possible is the instrumental noun *choroba* (by (his) illness).

Uczeń (The student)	wyjaśnił explained	nauczycielce to his teacher	swą nieobecność his absence
		chorobą. by illness.)	

But not only is such a sentence awkward, it is not representative of a productive phenomenon, since many 'explanations' do not lend themselves to nominal paraphrase, e.g. no such device would be possible to get all the arguments together in a single simplex for the following set of examples:

Uczeń (The student)	wyjaśnił explained	nauczycielce to his teacher	swą nieobecność. his absence.)
Uczeń (The student)	wyjaśnił explained	nauczycielce, to his teacher	że musiał pozostać that (he) had had to w domu, by pilnować młodszego brata w czasie gdy mama stay at home to watch (his) younger brother while (his) była w szpitalu u chorego ojca. mother was in the hospital with (his) sick father.])
Uczeń (The student)	wyjaśnił explained	nauczycielce to his teacher	swą nieobecność, his absence że musiał pozostać w domu, by pilnować młodszego that (he) had had to stay at home to watch (his) brata w czasie gdy mama była w szpitalu u chorego ojca. younger brother while (his) mother was in the hospital with (his) sick father.)

3.4 Subjectless sentences

Polish is among those languages of the world which allow free ellipsis of subjects: no independent constituents need appear in subject position, provided the subject is uniquely identifiable from either the linguistic or the extra-linguistic context. The one exception to this generalization is when the subject is a relative pronoun. In English, on the other hand, subject ellipsis is limited primarily to commands (*Go away!*) and questions directed to second-person subjects (*Coming along? Remember him?*).

Shopen (1973) points out that constituent ellipsis can be definite as well as indefinite. Katz and Postal (1964) discussed a kind of indefinite ellipsis in sentences such as *Almost all the contestants have been chosen*. Such sentences can be paraphrased with an additional phrase, *by someone*. But there is also a kind of constituent ellipsis that can only be paraphrased with definite pronouns. *Mary was pleased* could be paraphrased *Mary was pleased by it*, but not *Mary was pleased by something*. The contrast between indefinite and definite constituent ellipsis can be seen in active verb phrases as well. *George sold his car* can be paraphrased *George sold his car to someone*; by contrast, *They blamed Henry* could not be paraphrased *They blamed Henry for something*—the paraphrase could only be definite, as *They blamed Henry for it*.

Constituent ellipsis can be either indefinite or definite, but functional ellipsis, as in *Your necktie* or *In the library* is always definite, which is to say that the rest of the message must be uniquely identifiable in order for the utterance to be acceptable.

We find it striking that in all languages that we know of there can be constituent ellipsis involving objects which is either definite or indefinite, but subject ellipsis is definite. Thus *Wyszedł* (He left) can only mean "He left"; it could never mean "Someone left". For the latter meaning one would have to supply an indefinite pronoun in subject position, i.e., *Ktoś wyszedł*.

Some apparent counterexamples to our claim should be acknowledged and analyzed. On closer inspection, we believe we have cases that seem to strengthen our position. Notice that third person plural subject less sentences can have an impersonal sense in narratives such as the following:

Wiesz co się stało w Paryżu?	Ukradli mi walizkę!
(Do you know what happened in Paris?)	They stole my suitcase!

It is true that the thief may have been a single person, and the personal identity of the thief or thieves would not ordinarily be uniquely identifiable for either speaker or hearer; however, the sense of this example should be compared to that of the following:

Wiesz co się stało w Paryżu?	Ktoś ukradł mi walizkę!
(Do you know what happened in Paris?)	Someone stole my suitcase!

When the subjectless third person plural verb is used for 'steal', there is an implication that what happened is typical of what happens in Paris, the people there are held responsible in some sense. Exactly the same effect is achieved by the personal pronoun *they* in English (a definite form):

Do you know what happened in Paris? They stole my suitcase!
as compared to

Do you know what happened in Paris? Someone stole my suitcase!

We conclude that the use of the subjectless sentences in Polish noted here is definite in the same way that the English translations with *they* are definite, and that we are witnessing something like the 'ambient' extension of a personal pronoun meaning discussed by Bolinger (1973).

3.5 Autonomous elliptical expressions

Shopen has pointed out that there are productive elliptical patterns in English that are "autonomous" in the sense that they do not appear as sub-parts of non-elliptical sentences, such that they could be derived from non-elliptical sources by deletion rules alone. The existence of these patterns casts doubt on the very idea of deletion rules (cf. Shopen 1972a for a detailed discussion of the pattern in *Into the dungeon with him*, and Shopen 1974 for the pattern *How about the carburetor?*).

Polish has its own autonomous elliptical properties. Noun phrases used as whole utterances can appear in the nominative, even when the message communicated is such that any non-elliptical paraphrase would require an oblique case. For example, a surgeon in the midst of an operation stretches out his hand to an attendant and says: *Penseta!* (Pincette), even though the full message has to be paraphrased by something like "Proszę pana o podanie mi *pensety*" (I request that you give me the pincette), or "Proszę mi podać *pensetę*" (Give me the pincette, please).

There is a significantly large class of 'impersonal' expressions in Polish that have interesting autonomous properties. The expression *Padalo* receives different interpretations depending upon whether it is used anaphorically or non-anaphorically.

Consider the ambiguous sentence:

Dziecko bawiło się w ogrodzie. Padalo co chwila.
(Child played in garden. {Fell } every now and then.)
{Rained}

If an anaphoric reading is given to *padalo* with the noun *dziecko* (child) as the antecedent for the ellipsed subject, the reading is:

The child was playing in the garden. It fell now and then.

If, on the other hand, *padalo* is given a non-anaphoric interpretation, a quite different meaning emerges:

The child was playing in the garden. It rained every now and then.

The expression *Padalo* is all the more interesting because it has neuter gender⁴. This enables it to agree with the neuter noun *dziecko* (child), but the noun meaning "rain" is masculine, so that the non-elliptical way of expressing the meaning "It rained" is:

Deszcz padał
(Rain fell)

To derive the elliptical expression of "It rained" from a non-elliptical source would require a change in gender as well as a deletion. It would appear then that there is not any deletion at all and the expression *Padalo* (It rained) is listed in the lexicon as a homophone with the form *padalo* meaning "fell"; the deep structure for the sentence *Padalo* (It rained) would be simply:

S
|
VP
|
V
|
padalo

A somewhat similar state of affairs exists for elliptical sentences like *Grzmiało* (It thundered) and *Świtało* (It dawned). These verb forms are neuter even though the nouns which might be thought to be their subjects (*grzmot* (thunder) and *świt* (dawn)) are masculine. In contrast to *Padalo*, however, there would not appear to be any acceptable non-elliptical source, even if it were granted that more than deletion rules were allowed to derive elliptical

⁴ A possible objection might be raised to the effect that the *padalo* used in subjectless constructions is morphologically different from the *padalo* that occurs with subjects. We see no reasonable basis for such a view and will assume that it is indeed the same form. A distinction must be made between the past neuter $-o_1$ morpheme (corresponding to the past masc. $-o$, fem. $-a$, all neutralized to $-o$ in the present tense) which forms active finites of the *padalo* type, and the $-o_2$ morpheme found in non-finites carrying passive past meanings, as *widziano* ((one) saw=was (were) seen), *wzięto* ((one) took=was (were) taken). It is only with the latter that something like a 'fourth', or 'indefinite' gender (as well as neutralized number) category emerges as a result of contrasts with $-y$ (masc.), $-a$ (fem.), $-e$ (neut.), $-i$ (vir. pl.), $-e$ (non-vir. pl.); also are the adjectival functions of *widziany* ($-a$, $-e$, $-i$, $-e$) (seen), *wzięty* ($-a$, $-e$, $-i$, $-e$) (taken) distinct from *widziano*, *podjęto*, clearly verbal forms capable of being followed by direct objects (*widziano go*, one saw him=he was seen, *podjęto decyzję*, one took a decision=decision was taken). No comparable dichotomies are found with $-o_1$. Since $-o_2$ forms always appear in subjectless sentences *only*, and the 'implied' subjects are indefinite (at least in the sense that neither gender nor number can be specified), sentences like *Widziano go w kawiarni* ((One) saw him in the cafe), *Wzięto nas za intruzów* ((One) took us for intruders) must remain outside the scope of the present study of ellipsis.

expressions from non-elliptical sources. The sentences with subjects expressed are of questionable acceptability.

?Grzmot grzmiał.
(Thunder thundered)

*Świt świtał
(Dawn dawned)

The expressions *Mdlilo mnie* (I was getting sick—word-for-word: sickened me) *Poszło gładko* ((It) went smoothly), *Chciałoby się powiedzieć* ((One) would like to say) are characteristic of a class of perhaps a hundred more 'impersonal' expressions (always neuter) for which no conceivable subject noun exists (cf. Szober 1953: 303 ff. and Klemensiewicz 1953: 21–25 for some details of classification). It might be suggested that there are deep structures containing a neuter demonstrative pronoun *to*, similar in its semantic properties to the English ambient *it* (cf. Bolinger 1973). We have just one objection to such a proposal, but it would appear to us to be a conclusive one: that is that when the neuter pronoun actually appears on the surface, the meaning of the impersonal expressions is different—it is highly emphatic.

To padało!
(Did it ever rain!)

To grzmiało!
(Gosh, it thundered!)

?To świtało!
(That was a day for a dawn!)

If it is agreed that *to* is a subject, any possibility of underlying representations with ordinary personal pronouns would have to be ruled out since, and here we take exception to the views of Klemensiewicz (1953) and Szober (1953) for a variety of reasons, their appearance on the surface is unacceptable: *Ono padało* with the neuter pronoun *ono* could only mean "It fell" with reference to something other than "rain". The example below is also unacceptable when an anaphoric meaning is intended.

Deszcz był zimny. On padał co chwila.
(The rain was cold. It fell every now and then.)

One has the option of using either the masculine form *padal* with an anaphoric interpretation (with *deszcz* understood as the subject), or the neuter *padalo* (perhaps if there is a pause between the two sentences) with a non-anaphoric interpretation, but in either case no subject must be expressed.

Deszcz był zimny. Padal co chwila.
(The rain was cold. It fell every now and then.)

Deszcz był zimny. Padalo co chwila.
(The rain was cold. It rained every now and then.)

The grammar of Polish must have a phrase structure rule $S \rightarrow (NP)VP$.

These observations have important consequences for the lexicon and for the theory of context-sensitive constraints in a generative model. If case-marked nouns such as *kawa* and verb forms such as *padalo*, marked for gender and number, have autonomous properties such that they ought to be generated directly without any further linguistic context in the where they constitute whole utterances, then this suggests that inflectional morphology must be entered in the lexicon; furthermore, when the case marking of nouns of the inflection of verbs must agree with a larger linguistic contexts in non-elliptical constructions, the only general formulation of the context-sensitive constraints can be 'analytical' or 'interpretive'. This is to say that transformations cannot be used to synthesize words in order to insure well formed co-occurrences; the word must be viewed as the prime in syntax and the notion of paradigmatic structure must take an important place again in grammatical theory. Halle (1973) and Shopen (1971, 1972a, 1972b, and forthcoming) among others have argued for this position. But if this is correct, then the use of transformations as a means of characterizing the notion 'related sentence-types' will have to be re-evaluated.

4. Conclusions

We have said a good deal in this paper about ellipsis in Polish and English but much remains to be seen about the place of ellipsis in the theory of contrastive linguistics. In the more restricted and fundamental sense of contrastive linguistics as an area of strictly grammatical study, more research must be done in the various languages of the world. We need to know to what extent, there are significant typological distinctions in the matter of ellipsis and to what extent elliptical characteristics are related to other kinds of grammatical phenomena. The work of Mathesius reported by Vachek (1970 : 88-93) and that of Perlmutter (1971 : Chapter 4) are contributions in this direction. Surely there is a typological difference of some consequence between Polish and English when we see that Polish allows subject ellipsis more freely and that at the same time it has a larger stock of impersonal expressions. It is worth bearing in mind that Old English and Middle English were more like Polish in both these respects.

In the larger sense of contrastive analysis, we include the notion of style and the relation between language and thought. There we hope to make a contribution to language teaching. On the one hand, we wish to emphasize, as others have done, that ellipsis is a part of language and that one cannot be said to have command of a language without knowing how to say the short, elliptical things; moreover, it is important to see the evidence that ellipsis is a distinct means of encoding thought into language, not just a superficial

stylistic device. It follows that elliptical expressions should be taught, and with an understanding of their syntactic properties (cf. Mihailović 1971). On the other hand, there are some extremely difficult questions about the relation between thought and language which stand in the way of seeing how grammatical distinctions like ellipsis play a role in language performance. A second language learner is learning new ways of encoding thought into grammatical form. If we find typological differences in grammatical structure between two languages, we still cannot predict in any mechanical way how the language learner will perceive the structures of the new language, or what difficulties he will have in mastering them.

Principles of style and appropriateness are indispensable ingredients. At the same time the more we understand about the grammar of the first and the second language, the better off we are, because however it fits into the larger picture, grammatical structure is important in defining the framework within which the members of a culture can express their ideas. Ellipsis is part of that framework.

REFERENCES

- Bolinger, D. 1971. "Semantic overloading: a restudy of the verb *remind*". *Language* 47. 522-547.
- Bolinger, D. 1973. "Ambient *it* is meaningful too". *JL* 9/2. 261-270.
- Gruber, J. 1965. *Studies in lexical relations*. The MIT Ph.D. dissertation.
- Halle, M. 1973. "Prolegomena to a theory of word formation". *Linguistic inquiry* 4/1. 3-16.
- Jespersen, O. 1924. *The philosophy of grammar*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.
- Kachru, B.B. et al. (eds). 1973. *Issues in linguistics: papers in honor of Henry and Renée Kahne*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- Katz, J. J. and P. M. Postal. 1964. *An integrated theory of linguistic description*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Kirsner, R. S. 1971. "About *about* and the unity of *remind*". *Linguistic inquiry* 3/4. 489-499.
- Klemensiewicz, A. 1953. *Zarys składni polskiej*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Kruppik, B. 1970. *A grammar of English headlines*. Unpublished M. A. thesis, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin.
- Mihailović, M. 1971. "Elliptical sentences in English and their Serbo-Croatian equivalents". *The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English contrastive project*, Zagreb: University of Zagreb and Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
- Morgan, J. L. 1973. "Sentence fragments and the notion of sentence". In Kachru, B. B. et al. (eds). 1973.
- Perlmutter, D. M. 1971. *Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rywacki, J. 1973. *Aspects of syntax in English and Polish headlines*. Unpublished M. A. thesis, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin.

- Shopen, T. 1971. "Caught in the act". *Papers from the seventh regional meeting of the Chicago linguistic society*. 254-263.
- Shopen, T. 1972a. *A generative theory of ellipsis*. UCLA Ph.D. dissertation.
- Shopen, T. 1972b. "Context-sensitive constraints and grammatical indeterminacy". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America (Atlanta).
- Shopen, T. 1973. "Ellipsis as grammatical indeterminacy". *Fl 10*. 65-77.
- Shopen, T. 1974. "Some contributions from grammar to the theory of style". *College English 35/7*. 775-799.
- Shopen, T. (forthcoming). *Ellipsis: the linguistic use of silence*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.
- Szober, S. 1953. *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
- Vachek, J. 1970. *The linguistic school of Prague*. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press.