Ellipsis in the Sports Announcer Talk Register
in Japanese and English

Teruhiko FUKAYA, Sachiko Oda TANAKA and Phillip R. MORROW

1. Introduction

Ellipsis has been identified as a common feature of the Sports Announcer Talk (SAT) register (Ferguson 1983) and of Japanese conversation in general (Hinds 1980, 1982, Maynard 1989). In this paper we attempt to describe and offer some explanation for the use of ellipsis in the SAT register, and to compare Japanese and English regarding the use of ellipsis in SAT. In general, our study is concerned with the following questions: 1. What sentence elements can be ellipted ? 2. What kinds of ellipsis are most common ? 3. What function(s) does ellipsis serve at the discourse level ? 4. What differences are there between Japanese and English in the use of ellipsis ?

To investigate these questions we have transcribed and analyzed two bilingual recordings of American baseball games made in autumn 1992. By comparing texts which narrate the same event, we hoped to obtain data in which the contrasts between Japanese and English would be clear. We selected baseball SAT because ellipsis is a recognized feature of SAT.

It is often pointed out that Japanese is known for its ellipsis of verbal as well as nominal phrases and postpositional particles. However, ellipsis is also a feature of many registers of English and its occurrence in English was recognized by early grammarians such as Onions (1904, 1971, 1980) and Poutsma (1904-26). Onions (1980: 2-3) observed:

> Ellipsis plays a great part in English as in many languages.
> It is common to all styles of speaking and writing. In poetic-
> al and rhetorical language it often lends dignity and impress-
> iveness, with something of archaic flavour; to colloquial
> speech it gives precision and brevity, and saves time and
> trouble. It is especially appropriate to exclamations and
> abrupt commands.

Quirk et al. (1985) distinguishes three major categories of ellipsis: Situational, Textual and Structural. These types are distinguished according to the nature of the information that a hearer (or reader) uses to recover ellipted elements. Our analysis in Section 2 is based on this typology.

As for Japanese, the pervasiveness of ellipsis has been noted in many studies. Martin (1975: 185) for example, reports that the subject may be ellipted as much as 74% in conversation and 37% in expository discourse such as news broadcasts. Hinds (1980) notes that ellipsis is common in Japanese conversation. His study is concerned with describing the cognitive processes that enable listeners to recognize ellipsis and interpret ellipted elements. He proposes that three factors—the listener's structural knowledge about paragraphs, the accretion of information through the course of a conversation and the notion of scripts—make this possible.

Similarly, Kuno in *Danwa no Bumpoo* (Discourse Grammar) (1978: 1-124) posits some universal strategies, constraints and orderings for ellipsis. His principal maxim for ellipsis is that an element to be ellipted must be recoverable from linguistic or non-linguistic context. He also presents a hypothesis about the order of ellipsis which holds that the probability of ellipsis is inversely related to the newness or importance of the information supplied by the ellipted element, and cites examples from Japanese, English, French, Swedish, Hungarian and Polish in support of this claim.

For the SAT register, some features of ellipsis have been described by Ferguson (1983). He identifies ellipsis, along with other phenomena such as inversions, result expressions, heavy modifiers, tense usage and routines as important syntactic characteristics of that register. Ferguson's paper provided the starting point for our own study, although our study is confined to ellipsis alone, and our data differ from Ferguson's in that his are from radio and ours are from television.

Our discussion is organized as follows: Section 2 describes some syntactic aspects of textual, situational and structural ellipsis in English and Japanese SAT. In Section 3 we survey the functions of ellipsis at the discourse level and suggest that its use in SAT is related to three factors: production constraints, textual cohesion and social factors. In Section 4 we take up the question of how Japanese and English differ in regard to ellipsis in SAT. Our conclusions are summarized in Section 5.

2. Syntactic Aspects of Ellipsis

In this section we will investigate some syntactic aspects of ellipsis in the register of SAT. When they describe what they are observing in a baseball game, sports announcers and commentators make frequent use of sentences lacking certain expected elements in order to convey the drama of baseball actions. These typical examples are taken from Ferguson (1983).

(1)　a.　[He] had 6 homeruns.

　　　b.　[It] hit on the foul line.　(Ferguson 1983: 159)

Here pronouns are subject to ellipsis. We have also examples of ellipsis of pronoun

subject plus copula.

(2) a. [It's] a breaking ball outside.

   b. [He's a] guy who's a pressure player. (*ibid.* 159)

As Ferguson properly points out, the ellipsis of the indefinite article in (2b) is permissible on condition that there is no modifier present before the noun complement.

   There is another type of ellipsis readily available to SAT: copula ellipsis which in most cases takes place after a proper name.

(3) a. McCatty [is] in difficulty.

   b. Milburn [is] remaining at first. (*ibid.* 159-60)

The construction in (3) reminds us of a functionally similar ellipsis in newspaper headlines.

(4) A spymistress [is] breaking free from the shadows.

(*The Weekly Telegraph* July 21-27, 1993: 7)

Examples (3) and (4) share a register-oriented function of event-reporting, which motivates copula ellipsis and other shortening effects.

   Hence SAT tends to ellipt the subject noun or pronoun, as in (1) and ellipt the copula verb BE as well, as illustrated in (2). Examples in (3) ellipt BE alone.

   Holmes (1992) talks of an SAT utterance from an English soccer match.

(5) Dickens a marvellous through-ball. (Holmes 1992: 279)

She observes that the ellipted verb is predictably *kicks* or *provides* or something similar in meaning. This observation suggests that syntactic SAT ellipsis or reduction may not be limited in its conditions of occurrence but may actually have a considerable potential to be realized. In the following discussion, examples are drawn from our data and the analysis employs the framework of ellipsis developed in Quirk et al. (1985: chp. 12)

2.1 Textual ellipsis

   We begin with textual ellipsis, ellipsis of linguistic elements whose information is recoverable from a neighboring part of the text. A typical context is one where the relevant information is in the immediately preceding sentence.

(6) a. Pendleton has to hurry. [He] didn't get 'em.[1]

   b. A: Fan-ga   sugoi-desu-ne.

        fan-S   teriffic-is TAG

        'The fans are terrific.'

     B: [Fan-ga] sugoi-desu-ne.

These examples illustrate one way in which the ellipted subject of the second sentence is supplied through the first sentence. Although anaphoric ellipsis is the dominant type of textual ellipsis, our SAT corpus provides a case of cataphoric ellipsis as well.

(7) [kare-wa] regular-no chii-o ubawaremashite, kare-wa hotondo deru-maku-ga arimasendesita.

[He-T] regular-LK position-O deprive-PASS-since, he-T almost a game-in play-NEG-PAST

'Deprived of a regular position, he could hardly play in a game.'

Note that cataphoric ellipsis occurs in a clause which is subordinate to the clause in which the antecedent (i.e. *kare*) occurs.

2.2 Situational ellipsis

A second type is situation al ellipsis, whose interpretation is dependent upon knowledge of an extralinguistic context. When we talk about baseball, what attracts our attention most is the ball, without which players' actions make no sense. We find in our corpus abundant instances of sentences with their subject *the ball* missing.

(8) a. [The ball] [is] way outside.

b. [The ball] [is] up and in, backing Maldonado off the plate.

c. [ball-wa] wazukani soto.

'a little outside'

d. [ball-wa] ochimashita.

'dropped'

The announcer more often than not starts his discourse without mentioning the subject NP *the ball*, assuming *the ball* to be present in the viewers' consciousness and treating it as an ever-present covert theme.

This situational ellipsis of *the ball* occurs in the object position in our Japanese data, but not in the English data.

(9) [Batter-wa] center-e [ball-o] uchikaeshi-ta.

[Batter-T] center-to [ball-O] hit-Past

'The batter hit the ball to center field.

The topic in the previous sentence is the batter Ohlarude but there is no reference to the ball. Then in (9) the announcer initiated his play-by-play description as Ohlarude got a hit. The missing subject in (9) is a topical subject recoverable from the preceding sentence (i.e., a case of textual ellipsis), whereas there is no identifying the antecedent for the object ellipsis from the linguistic environment. In the register of SAT, the addressee can arrive at the interpretation of *the ball* as the object NP.

We have seen in (8) and (9) that the register of SAT supplies elliptical sentences with the subject or the object NP *the ball*. Similar reasoning can be easily established in the case of (10):

(10) [Batter-wa] [fulai-o] uchiagemshi-ta

[batter-T] hit-PAST [a fly]

There is no reference to the batter in the surrounding linguistic context, but the addressee has no difficulty in understanding the subject NP in (10) to be the batter. Example (11) indicates that even *the umpire* is obtainable from the SAT vocabulary.

    (11) [Umpire-wa] wazukani soto-to mitandesukane.

          [umpire-T] a little outside decided

          'The umpire decided it was a little outside.'

All the examples of (8) to (11) are interpretable only when we assume that we can access lexical information from the register of baseball talk.

In addition to situational ellipsis particular to SAT above, our corpus includes more unmarked situational ellipsis. In English, subjectless statements generally receive an interpretation involving a first person subject. With respect to verbs of internal feelings especially, the suppliable subject is *I* or *We*, because only the person involved is aware of his or her internal feelings.

    (12) a. Tom Glavin was asked... if he thought the Braves would suffer from the lingering aftereffects of their dramatic victory...

            [I] thought he gave a great answer.

        b. Steal-wa nai-to [watashi-wa] omoimasu.

            steal-T isn't-NOM [I] think

            'I don't think he will steal second.'

        c. [watashi-wa] taihen ureshii-desu-ne.

            [I] very pleased-am-TAG

            'I am very pleased.'

These verbs of internal feelings provide us with a good case for first person subjects.

Before closing our arguments about situational ellipsis, we should touch upon some contexts where the exact words ellipted might be unclear.

    (13) a. First and second with two down in the Toronto second.

        b. wan-auto ichirui-desu.

            one down first base

There seem to be no grounds for positing the existence and deletion of the linguistic subjects NP. Therefore it is reasonable to regard the cases in (13) as subject nonrealization, following Thomas (1979).

2.3 Structural ellipsis

We turn now to a third category of ellipsis, structural ellipsis, where the ellipted words can be determined purely based on grammatical knowledge. In this category we may place the following example from our corpus.

    (14) Glavin [is] not only pitching... but [is] trying to shed the label that he can't win in the post-season, and [is] also trying to earn himself his next starting

game four.

The occurrence of such structural ellipsis should be accounted for by the requirement imposed by the SAT register that announcers are supposed to give play-by-play description, focusing on baseball players' action. However, the same account cannot apply blindly to Japansese structural ellipsis in (15).

(15) a. fudanwa DH [desu].
          usually DH
          'He is usually a DH.'

      b. 5-kai toorui-shite 2-kai seiko [shita].
          5 times steal try twice success
          'He tried to steal 5 times and succeeded twice.'

In (15a), it is the copular verb itself that is ellipted and furnished by the grammar. On the other hand, (15b) can be characterized as a sentence-final nominalization.

We have made an attempt to recategorize elliptical expressions typically occurring in the discourse of SAT. The attempt has highlighted the point that the crucial ellipsis for the location of the register 'sports announcer talk' is situational ellipsis with reference to the lexical framework of SAT.

3. Functions of Ellipsis in SAT

In previous sections we noted that ellipsis is a common feature of SAT and we examined some of the syntactic aspects of ellipsis in the SAT registers of English and Japanese. In this section we will consider some of the reasons for ellipsis, or what functions ellipsis serves in SAT texts. There are at least three different types of factors that are related to the occurrence of ellipsis in SAT: production constraints, textual cohesion and social factors. We will discuss each of these briefly below.

3.1 Production Constraints

As Ferguson (1983) noted, SAT consists of narration of on-going action and commentary about it—usually background information about the event or the participants. In sports events the action being narrated often occurs very rapidly, with actions sometimes overlapping or occurring simultaneously. The announcer's talk must keep pace with the action, and when the action is fast, the announcer must speak fast or in some way shorten what he says in order to keep up with it. One way to do this is to ellipt sentence elements that are easily recoverable from the linguistic or situational context. Thus in English SAT one frequently hears sentences like (16a), in which ellipsis of several elements enables an announcer to convey information more rapidly than fully specified version (16b) would.

(16a) The two-two from Smolts. Fast ball an' Maldanado laid off it.

(16b) That pitch was the two-two pitch from Smolts. It was a fast ball and Maldonado laid off it.

3.2 Textual Cohesion

A second type of constraint related to the use of ellipsis is the need for a text to be cohesive. One characteristic of texts is that the parts of them are connected to each other in various ways, and this connectedness is what 'cohesive' refers to. Halliday and Hasan (1976) have identified various types of linguistic devices that function as cohesive ties in a text: reference, substitution, lexical relationships, logical connectives, and ellipsis. Halliday and Hasan maintain that in sentences such as (17), ellipsis creates a cohesive tie between the first part of the sentence and the second.

(17) Claude ate spinach and Stella [ate] aspargus.

Speakers may not consciously use ellipsis to create cohesion in the texts they produce, yet ellipsis does have a cohesive function, and sentences with ellipted elements may be more natural or unmarked in comparison with sentences in which the ellipted elements are inserted, as illustrated in (18a) and (18b) below.

(18a) Now John Ohlarude. Fast ball. Missed, for ball one.
(18b) Now John Ohlarude [is batting]. [That was a] fast ball. [He] missed [it], for ball one.

(18b) though correct and complete is less natural and more marked than (18a) in the SAT register. We are proposing that what makes (18a) more natural in this register is that it is more cohesive, and that its greater cohesiveness results from its being elliptical. (18a) and (18b) are from English, but it is also true in Japanese that sentences with ellipted elements may be more natural or unmarked than sentences in which all elements are specified.

3.3 Social Factors

A third factor that influences the use of ellipsis is the need to achieve harmony and build social bonds through interaction. Malinowski (1923: 315) referred to this function of language as 'phatic communion'. Malinowski, and others since (e.g. Cheepen and Monaghan 1990) have pointed out that in much interaction the main function is not to transmit information, but rather to build or strengthen the relationship between interlocutors. Ellipsis serves this need by involving a speaker's interlocutor in the production of the talk. Ellipsis encourages the listener to be actively engaged in the talk since the listener needs to do a certain amount of 'filling in' in order to interpret an utterance containing ellipted elements. It is not clear exactly what cognitive processes are involved in the interpretation of elliptical sentences though some researchers (e.g. Hinds 1980) have proposed principles that listeners use in recovering ellipted elements. In any case, elliptical sentences in-

volve listeners in the interpretive process to a greater degree than non-elliptical sentences.

In the sense that ellipsis promotes a high degree of interaction between speakers and listeners, it is similar in function to other phenomena that have been noted as characteristics of Japanese conversation (Maynard 1989): final particles, fillers, sentence-final forms, co-creation of utterances, questions as conversational elicitors, and others. These, along with special turn-taking strategies and back-channel cues have a common function of promoting a high level of interaction or involvement between speakers. Maynard identified this high level of interaction and the fragmentation of talk as the two most fundamental characteristics of Japanese conversation, and ellipsis is related to both of these.

4. Differences of Ellipsis in Japanese and English

It was pointed out in section 2 that among the three types of ellipsis situational ellipsis best characterises SAT. In this section we will look at some of the major differences between Japanese and English in the use of ellipsis in SAT.

A speaker ellipts an element when he or she feels that it is recoverable by the hearer from linguistic and/or non-linguistic context. In SAT the expected lexicon and formulaic expressions as well as the topic are fairly limited and consequently ellipted elements can often be recovered much easier in SAT than in ordinary face to face conversation.

Furthermore, due to the nature of our corpus, that it comes from SAT on television, the main role of the announcer is reduced to that of providing the viewers with an analysis of the play and detailed background information on the players and former games instead of the play-by-play reporting required for the radio. In fact, the announcer, the commentator, and the viewers share so much knowledge of the situation that the ratio of play-by-play reporting by the announcer to the amount of offering analysis and background information in our corpus is less than one to three in English and about one to five in Japanese.

This ratio of reporting versus commenting was calculated by simply counting the transcribed lines, and the different figures for the two languages reflect different styles of broadcasting: in English the announcer and the commentator each take the floor longer than does the Japanese counterpart. Thus in Game One of our corpus there are 32 turns in English but 116 in Japanese in the same duration of time. We may say that the main role of commentator in Japanese is more of a 'conversational partner' rather than that of a strict 'commentator' in English. Although this is an interesting topic to be pursued, we have to leave this for future research.

In order to highlight the difference between Japanese and English in the use of

ellipsis in SAT we will restrict our data to a strict play-by-play analysis to see how the same event is reported in two languages. We will discuss three major differences below: ellipsis of verbal elements, ellipsis of nominal elements, and ellipsis in formulaic expressions in the case of introducing a batter.

4.1 Verbal ellipsis

One of the most striking differences in the use of ellipsis in Japanese (J) and English (E) is the case in which only the subject is mentioned in Japanese, and the verbal element is completely ellipted as in (19J) and (20J), while the same event is reported by complete sentences in English. In what follows players' names are written in the same way both in English and Japanese for convenience sake.

(19)　J.　[Batter-wa] Takai baundo-no sanrui　　goro [-o uchimashita].
　　　　　　[batter-T] high bound-POSS third-base ground-ball [-O hit]
　　　　　　Pendleton. [Batter-wa] ichirui [-ni] seefu desu.
　　　　　　Pendleton. [batter-T] first-base [-on] safe BE
　　　　　　'The batter chopped the ball off to the third base.　*Pendleton.*
　　　　　　He is safe on the first base'

　　　　E.　[The ball] Chopped off the plate. *Pendleton has to hurry.* [He] *Didn't get 'em.*

(20)　J.　*Center White.*

　　　　E.　*It's caught by Devon White.*

If the game is heard on the radio, neither (19J) nor (20J) can be properly understood because the listener has no idea what Pendleton or White is doing. In both cases the production constraint mentioned in the previous section may explain why the Japanese announcer has ellipted all the elements except the agent noun phrase. Two subject noun phrases [Batter-wa] in the Japanese sentences in (19J) and [He] in the English sentence (20E) are ellipted for textual cohesion. While (20J) may be interpreted as 'The ball flew toward centerfielder White', or 'centerfielder White is waiting to catch the ball', or 'Centerfielder White catches the ball', we do not expect (20J) to be an ellipted form of the passive sentence (20E).

4.2 Nominal ellipsis

The second difference is found in cases (21J) and (22J) where there is ellipsis of subject and object noun phrases in (21J) and of the subject noun phrase in (22J), although there is no ellipsis in the English sentences.

(21)　J.　[Batter-wa] [ball-o] Karafuri　　sanshin [shimashita].
　　　　　　[Batter-T] [ball-O] swing-and-miss three-swing [did]
　　　　E.　He struck him out.

(22)　J.　[Batter-wa] sanshin [shimashita].
　　　　E.　Blauser strikes out.

In English the topic of the comment previous to (21E) is about the pitcher, which is why the announcer makes the pitcher the subject (and the batter the object) rather than the batter as in (22E).

4.3 Ellipsis in formulas

The third difference to be noted between Japanese and English is the way a new batter is introduced. In introducing a new batter, the subject 'the batter' is usually ellipted both in English and Japanese. In English an introduction begins with the full name of the player (written in italics below) when his picture appears on the screen, followed by his background information:

(23) a. *Kelly Gruber* is at the top year throughout offensively...
      b. *Dave Winfield*, in the World Series for the second time...
      c. *Pat Borders* hit 3-18 against Oakland...
      d. *Candy Maldonado*. This really potentially is a series...

On the other hand, in Japanese players are introduced by a formulaic expression as we see in sentences (24): the batting order, the defense position, and the Last Name of the player. For example, when the screen shows Kelly Gruber walking to the batter's box, the Japanese announcer says (24a) in which both the subject noun phrase and the copulative verb are ellipted. Other examples in (24) follow the same pattern:

(24) a. [Batter-wa] Rokuban-no saado   *Gruber* [desu].
          [Batter-T] sixth-POSS thirdbaseman Gruber [BE]
          'Next is the sixth batter, thirdbaseman Gruber'
      b. Yoban-no raito *Winfield*... 'Fourth batter rightfielder Winfield'
      c. Yanaban-no cacchaa *Borders*. 'Seventh batter catcher Borders'
      d. Goban-no lehuto *Maldonado*. 'Fifth batter leftfielder Maldonado'

Counting balls and strikes against a player, and counting the number of outs in an inning are two more events that are reported play-by-play in formulaic expressions. Although several types of nominal and verbal ellipsis are used both in Japanese and English, we have not found much difference in the use of ellipsis except that strikes are mentioned before balls in Japanese. For instance, if a batter gets one strike and two balls, it is "one-two" in Japanese, but "two-one" in English.

In this section three major differences between Japanese and English in the use of SAT are pointed out. Although there exist several types and functions of ellipsis both in Japanese and English SAT, when the same event is described in two languages, we have noted that there is more frequent ellipsis of verbal as well as nominal phrases in Japanese than in English. In Japanese a new batter must he identified first by his batting order and fielding position before his name, that is, his status in the team as a system. However, in English he is first introduced as a

person with his full name, followed by his background information of various kinds. Does this reflect two different cultures even if the ball game itself is identical?

5. Conclusion

In this study we have uncovered some interesting facts and patterns about ellipsis in Japanese and English SAT. First of all, we could confirm what others have reported: that ellipsis is very common in SAT, both in Japanese and English. Regarding the nature of ellipsis, we found that SAT contains instances of all three of the classes of ellipsis identified by Quirk et al. (1985: chp. 12): textual ellipsis, situational ellipsis and structural ellipsis. Of these, situational ellipsis is the one most characteristic of SAT because interpretation of the ellipted elements depends on knowledge of the SAT register. We also noted a few differences between Japanese and English in the occurrence of some types of ellipsis, for example, that ellipsis of *the ball* in object position occurs in our Japanese data, but not in our English data. In Section 3 we observed that the occurrence of ellipsis is related to some discourse level factors, and we identified three such factors that are significant for ellipsis in the SAT register: production constraints, textual cohesion, and social factors. The first deals with constraints imposed by cognitive and physical processes involved in language production, the second with requirements for an integrated and natural text, and the third with social factors—in particular, the social goals speakers hope to achieve by engaging in talk. Each of these, at different times and to different degrees, contributes the use of ellipsis in the SAT register.

Finally, in Section 4 we looked at some of the differences in ellipsis between Japanese and English. In this section we compared what the Japanese and English announcers said about the same event. We found several instances in which in the Japanese text only the subject was mentioned and the verbal elements were completely ellipted, while the American announcer used a complete sentence to describe or comment on the action. Similarly, there were other instances in which the subject and sometimes the object were ellipted in Japanese, while there was no ellipsis in the American announcer's comments. One further notable difference is in the way batters are introduced. In Japanese there is a standard routine or formula in which only the batter's number, position and name are given and other sentence elements are ellipted, while in English full names are given and there is no particular routine for introductions.

These findings shed some light on the nature of ellipsis in SAT, which is an issue of interest since ellipsis is such a noticeable feature of SAT. We hope to see more studies of ellipsis in other registers that are characterized by simplified language.

Teruhiko FUKAYA · Sachiko Oda TANAKA · Phillip R. MORROW

NOTES

1) We have used following abbreviations:

BE	copulative verb, be
LK	linker (linking nominals and nominal adjectives)
NEG	negative marker
NOM	nominalizer
O	direct object marker
PASS	passive morpheme
POSS	possessive morpheme
S	subject marker
T	theme marker
TAG	tag-question marker

References

Cheepen, Christine and James Monaghan. (1990) *Spoken English: A Practical Guide*. London: Pinter.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1983) "Sports announcer talk: Syntactic aspects of register variation", *Language in Society* 12, 153-172.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hinds, John. (1980) "Japanese conversation, discourse structure, and ellipsis", *Discourse Processes* 3, 263-286.

Hinds, John. (1982) "Japanese conversational structures", *Lingua* 57, 327-355.

Holmes, Janet. (1992) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Kuno, Susumu. (1978) *Danwa-no Bumpo* (Discourse Grammar). Tokyo: Taishukan.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1923) "The problem of meaning in primitive languages", in C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards. *The Meaning of Meaning*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Martin, Samuel E. (1975) *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Maynard, Senko K. (1989) *Japanese Conversation: Self-contextualization through Structure and Interactional Management* (vol. XXXV in the series, R.O. Freedle (ed.) *Advances in Discourse Processes*). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Onions, C.T. (1904, 1971[2], 1980[3]) *Modern English Syntax* (Original title as *An Advance English Syntax*). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Poutsma, Hendrik. (1904-24) *A Grammar of Late Modern English* 5 vols. Groningen: Norordhoff.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Thomas, Andrew L. (1979) "Ellipsis: the interplay of sentence structure and context", *Lingua* 47, 43-68.