

1. INTRODUCTION

In many languages, there are phenomena where a string that has already been uttered, is omitted where it would otherwise have to be repeated word for word (Carnie, 2013; 457). These kinds of phenomena are called ellipses (its singular form is ellipsis).

There are various types of ellipsis. The most common of them are presented here. Each type is followed by an example (Carnie, 2013, Culicover & Jackendoff, 2005);

- Bare Argument Ellipsis;
-What did Pat buy?
- A motorcycle.
- Sluicing; Bill's leaving, but I don't know why.
- Sluice-stranding; Bill's coming, but I don't know who with.
- Gapping; Sam plays the saxophone and Susan the guitar.
- Not... let alone; Sam doesn't play the saxophone, let alone/ not to mention/ never mind the guitar.
- VP-ellipsis; Who wants to come along? I do!
- Do X anaphora; John gave \$5000, but I could never do that.
- Pseudogapping; If you don't believe me, you will the weatherman.
- Antecedent Contained Ellipsis (ACD); Brandon read every book that Megan did.
- Comparative deletion; I've read more books than you.
- Stripping; My mum is coming tomorrow, not Friday.
- N-ellipsis; I only brought one book, but I see you have two.
- One anaphora; Leslie read a long book about Lincoln, and Steve read a short one about Stalin.

2. PHENOMENON APPROACHES

The phenomenon of ellipsis was initially studied by Ross (1967, 1969) and has been the object of study especially for generative linguists. The question that is raised is whether the non-uttered strings are indeed omitted or whether the structure contains

phonologically null elements. For that reason, there are two proposals presented in Carnie (2013).

The first proposal is the PF (Phonological Form)-deletion hypothesis. According to this operation, the string is initially inside the VP but it is eventually omitted. The deletion happens between the SPELL OUT and the Phonological Form, so that the pronunciation but not the interpretation of the sentence is affected. The structure is present in the LF, but absent in the PF.

The second proposal is called LF (Logical Form)-copying hypothesis. Here, the omitted parts are null pronominals that are coindexed with their antecedent. At D-Structure and PF they are just null elements that are not pronounced, but at LF the antecedent is copied over and the structure gets its interpretation (Carnie, 2013; 461).

There is another one proposal, presented in Culicover & Jackendoff (2005), which is not an entirely generative approach. The trigger for this proposal is the interpretation of Bare Argument Ellipsis (BAE). Then, their proposal is also spread to other types of ellipsis, like Sluicing. It is concluded that there should not be just the generative approach and that many more parameters must be taken in consideration; pragmatic, discourse or even nonlinguistic. Perception and memory may, also, play a major role.

There are studies that are in favour of the aforementioned aspect. It is claimed that not only syntactic and semantic parameters must be taken into consideration, but also pragmatic and discourse, as well. This way the phenomenon of ellipsis will be analysed thoroughly. (Ginzburg & Cooper, 2004 and Kehler, 2000)

3. AIMS OF THE THESIS

Studies related to ellipsis in Greek are generative-driven. More specifically, there are studies in Sluicing (Merchant, 2000 and Vlachos 2011 & 2012), Comparative deletion (Merchant, 2009), Verb-stranding ellipsis (Merchant, 2018) and VP-ellipsis (Ntelitheos, 2003).

The first aim of this thesis is to investigate and analyse the types of ellipsis one will find in Greek. In addition to this, there will be presented some other parameters,

like negation. This parameter is of great interest, because the types of clausal negation in Greek, *ðen* and *min* are not chosen on most occasions; the type *oçi* is used instead. This type is used in elliptical structures and might be a helpful hint on the matter of the omitted elements mentioned above. (see PF-deletion hypothesis and LF-copying hypothesis)

The second aim of this thesis is related to the need of investigating the alternative approaches of the phenomenon of ellipsis and not only the syntactic ones. This is the reason why there will be an effort to study it from a cognitive perspective. It is a well-known fact that there are many differences between generative and cognitive linguistics but the comparison of the two schools will offer not only a more complete view of the phenomenon but also the opportunity of a combination of the two theories. It is worth mentioning that as far as the cognitive approach is concerned, there are no studies in Greek.

4. REFERENCES

- Carnie A. (2013). *Syntax; A Generative Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Culicover P. & R. Jackendoff (2005). *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fauconnier G. (1994). *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier G. & M. Turner (2002). *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ginzburg J. & R. Cooper (2004). Clarification, Ellipsis and the Nature of Contextual Updates in Dialogue. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 297–365.
- Kehler A. (2000). Coherence and the Resolution of Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23, 533–575.
- Langacker R. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar; A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant J. (2000). Islands and LF-movement in Greek sluicing. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1.1, 41-64.
- Merchant J. (2009). Phrasal and clausal comparatives in Greek and the abstractness of syntax. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 9, 49-79.

- Merchant J. (2018). Verb-stranding predicate ellipsis in Greek, implicit arguments, and ellipsis-internal focus. In Merchant J., Mikkelsen L., Rudin D., & K. Sasaki (eds.), *A reasonable way to proceed: Essays in honor of Jim McCloskey*. California: University of California eScholarship Repository, 228-269.
- Ntelitheos D. (2003). *The Syntax of Emphasis: Split DPs and Nominal Ellipsis*. 6th International Conference of Greek Linguistics, Department of Philology, University of Crete, Rethymno, Greece.
- Ross J. (1967). *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Ross J. (1969). Guess Who, In Binnick R. I., Davison A., Green G. M., & J. L. Morgan (eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th Annual Meeting of CLS*, 252–86.
- van Craenenbroeck J. & T. Temmerman. (2018). *The Oxford handbook of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vlachos C. (2011). The Mechanics of Sluicing. *Linguistic Analysis* 37: 273–314.
- Vlachos C. (2012). *Wh-constructions and the division of labour between syntax and the interfaces*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Patras.