

## Research proposal

**Title of research proposal** *Focus and ellipsis*

### Summary of research proposal

Keywords: syntax, ellipsis, focus, cross-linguistic variation

This project aims at investigating the syntactic role of focus in ellipsis across languages.

In elliptical sentences, parts of information that are clear to the listener are left out. In coordinated sentences such as *Mary ate an apple and John (~~ate~~) a banana*, the verb *ate* is left out in the second sentence (indicated in strikethrough). Nevertheless, elliptical sentences are perfectly grammatical and speakers always know what the missing material corresponds to.

Most work in ellipsis has hitherto focused on the nature of the missing material. By contrast, the *main research question* of this project will be to investigate the nature of the remaining material in elliptical sentences: the remnant. Remnants of ellipsis, such as *John* and *a banana* in the sentence above, have the special property of being *focused*: they are pronounced emphatically with contrastive stress. This property of the remnants of ellipsis has not been studied systematically before.

Languages differ with respect to the types and properties of elliptical sentences that they allow. So far, cross-linguistic variation in ellipsis has remained largely unexplained. The *main hypothesis* of this research project is that cross-linguistic variation in the marking of focus determines the cross-linguistic variation attested in ellipsis.

To test this hypothesis and its consequences for linguistic theory, the project will launch a cross-linguistic study into the nature of focus and ellipsis remnants in languages with typologically distinct focus marking strategies. By comparing (i) focus in elliptical and non-elliptical sentences, (ii) focus in different types of elliptical sentences and (iii) ellipsis in languages with distinct strategies of focus marking, we will obtain a complete picture of the complex relationship between ellipsis and focus.

**Host institution** (if known)      Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL)

### Description of the proposed research

(Use a maximum of 4000 words on no more than 8 pages, not including literature references (2e) and the utilisation paragraph (2f) if applicable. Please indicate the number of words used. A description of sub-projects and their interaction is required.

Include details of:)

### Research topic

When we speak, much of the information we convey is so clear to our listeners that we don't have to say it. So we leave it out. This phenomenon is called ellipsis. *Ellipsis* gives us a chance to communicate efficiently: without ellipsis, communication would be tedious. In the following dialogue, if the struck-through parts were to be pronounced every time, the conversation would be quite repetitious:

- (1) — Did you study linguistics?  
— Yes, I did ~~study linguistics~~. I studied linguistics and philosophy in fact.  
— Why ~~did you study~~ these two?  
— I ~~studied these two~~ because I am interested in how we think and how one brain conveys information to another ~~brain~~.  
— What did you write your thesis about?

— ~~I wrote my thesis about~~ ellipsis.

Ellipsis thus allows us to be brief. Interestingly though, brevity does not come at the price of losing information. Speakers know precisely what the missing material corresponds to. In the above sentences, the missing parts can only correspond to the strikethrough material, no other kind of interpretation is allowed. This shows that elliptical sentences are by no means incomplete. They present the ultimate challenge for any linguistic theory that aims to explain how *form* is related to *meaning*. In ellipsis there is meaning, but there does not seem to be any corresponding form. Another curious property of ellipsis is that material cannot be left out randomly. There are strict syntactic rules determining what can be missing. In English, if the main verb is deleted leaving the subject behind, the auxiliary must be left behind, too:

- (2) — Did you study linguistics?  
— ✓Yes, I did ~~study linguistics.~~/\*Yes, I ~~studied linguistics.~~

In French the same type of answer is not allowed:

- (3) — Est-ce que tu as étudié la linguistique?  
— \* Oui, j'ai ~~étudié la linguistique.~~

Among other things, this project will address the question of why this is so. What determines what can be left behind in ellipsis in various languages? What are the syntactic rules determining the distribution of the elements left behind and why do languages differ in what they allow? Significantly, ellipsis research has neglected these issues so far. It mostly concerned itself with the properties of the *missing material* only: how it is grammatically represented, licensed and interpreted. The rules determining the composition of the *pronounced material*, the so-called *remnant(s)*, have not been studied systematically.

Remnants have exceptional properties. They carry emphatic stress, which indicates contrastive interpretation or new information status. Consider the elliptical sentence in (4). Mary is contrasted with her mother, and an apple with a banana (indicated in bold); the contrasting elements are called the *focus* of the sentence.

- |     |                        |                   |                      |                  |
|-----|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|
|     | ANTECEDENT CLAUSE      |                   | ELLIPTICAL CLAUSE    |                  |
| (4) | Mary ate an apple, and | <b>her mother</b> | ate                  | <b>a banana.</b> |
|     |                        | <i>remnant</i>    | <i>ellipsis site</i> | <i>remnant</i>   |

In (4), the antecedent *ate* precedes the ellipsis site, so ellipsis is said to apply *forward*. The antecedent clause and the elliptical clause can also be ordered in the reverse way, with the elliptical clause coming first. This ordering is called *backward* ellipsis. In backward ellipsis, a constituent next to the missing chunk is focused, too (there is contrast between *I* and *we*):

- |     |  |                |                      |                     |
|-----|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|     | ELLIPTICAL CLAUSE                                |                | ANTECEDENT CLAUSE    |                     |
| (5) | John said that <b>I</b> <del>love jazz</del> and | Mary said that | <b>we</b> love jazz. | (Backward ellipsis) |

Remnants in all types of elliptical constructions share the characteristic of being in focus. Focus, just like ellipsis, is a universal ingredient of communication. Sentences are connected by an intricate system of information-structuring, in which focus marks elements that are new, non-presupposed or contrastive in a given utterance. There is a lot of variation in languages in how focus is marked. In brief, some languages have a strategy that puts special intonation on the focused element, others use a particular word or word order, or a complex syntactic construction. Yet others use a combination of these strategies for the expression of focus.

As with focus, there is a lot of syntactic variation between languages concerning ellipsis. There is a wide range of ellipsis types, named by colourful terms, e.g. gapping, pseudo-gapping, sluicing, stripping, fragments, etc. Languages vary considerably as to which of these types they allow (see 2 and 3 above). No research so far has looked at how this variation can be linked to other properties of languages. This is largely due to the fact that the focus nature of the remnants has been left unstudied (with the notable, but sporadic, exception of Hartmann 2001, Winkler 2005, Gengel 2006). This is a serious omission because a clear link can be established: since ellipsis remnants are focus items and languages vary in the expression of focus, the idea readily suggests itself that *the variation in ellipsis is determined by the variation found in the marking of focus*. The purpose of this project is to check the validity of this idea and work out its consequences for linguistic theory.

THE PROJECT PROPOSAL This project aims at understanding the syntactic relation between focus and ellipsis. The central research question and hypothesis are:

Central question: What is the relation between focus and ellipsis?

Central hypothesis: Variation among languages in the domain of ellipsis is determined by the variation in the marking of focus.

This issue will be investigated by studying the specifics of focal remnants in ellipsis, in particular, the following subissues:

- (i) Focus is a non-uniform phenomenon. There are various subtypes of focus in languages. Do we find similar variation among focus remnants in ellipsis as well?
- (ii) There are various focusing strategies languages use to mark focus (intonation, word order, special words or the combination of these). Do we find the same variation in the marking of focus remnants in ellipsis?
- (iii) In any given language, do the available focus marking strategies determine what kind of ellipsis remnants — and hence what kind of ellipsis — the language allows?
- (iv) Is there a difference between forward and backward ellipsis in all these respects (i-iii)?

Our specific working HYPOTHESES are the following:

(I) (corresponding to i) Focus remnants in ellipsis have as many subtypes as focus in non-elliptical sentences.

(II) (corresponding to ii) Of the various available focus marking strategies languages only use a specific one in ellipsis: rearranging word order (specifically, movement).

(III) (corresponding to iii) For any given language, there is a correlation between the available ellipsis types and the available focus strategies: the available focus strategies determine the available ellipsis types.

(IV) (corresponding to iv) Forward ellipsis differs from backward ellipsis in that forward ellipsis licenses an exceptional focus strategy that is not available in non-elliptical sentences. This is because backward and forward ellipsis employ different mechanisms.

## Approach

To answer the research questions and to test the working hypotheses, the project will study the similarities between focus and ellipsis together with possible dissimilarities. We will look at the following kinds of symmetries and asymmetries:

- (a) (a)symmetries between elliptical and non-elliptical sentences in expressing focus  
To find out how focus operates in ellipsis, we will compare focus in ellipsis to focus in a domain where its role is well studied: non-elliptical sentences. We will investigate if focus remnants come in as many varieties as focus in non-elliptical sentences and whether they are syntactically represented by the same focusing strategies.
- (b) (a)symmetries between backward and forward ellipsis  
Research into focus remnants requires the investigation of two domains: forward (cf. 4) and backward ellipsis (cf. 5). Dividing the empirical domain this way is necessary because backward ellipsis is more restricted in the types and number of focal remnants it allows (cf. 10 below), and arguably involves a different mechanism. As a result, a comprehensive study on ellipsis must investigate both.
- (c)(a)symmetries between languages with typologically different focus marking strategies  
In order to discover universally valid generalizations concerning (a)-(b) above, research needs to be concerned with cross-linguistic differences between languages with respect to ellipsis and focus. So far, research on ellipsis has primarily concentrated on English, and the insights have not been tested in a wider empirical domain. We will systematically compare ellipsis remnants in various languages, to cover *the full range of typological variation attested in the expression of focus*. We will compare languages where focus is expressed by (Büring 2006):
  - (i) prosodic means (e.g. English)
  - (ii) non-standard constituent order that satisfies phonological requirements (e.g. Spanish)
  - (iii) syntactic movement (e.g. Hungarian)
  - (iv) syntactic movement and morphological marking (e.g. Gungbe)
  - (v) a biclausal cleft structure (e.g. Zulu)
  - (iv) special inflection (e.g. Hausa)We will do a cross-linguistic comparison of the languages in brackets. Should it turn out that ellipsis is severely constrained in them, they will be replaced by another language of the same focus marking type.

**THE PROJECTS** The main research questions are studied in two subprojects. The postdoc project studies the interaction between ellipsis and focus in forward ellipsis, while the PhD project does the same for backward ellipsis. This division is natural because focus plays a different role in forward and backward ellipsis, necessitating a separate project for both, with the results of each subproject feeding into the other. Backward ellipsis furthermore is less frequent among languages and ellipsis types, so the empirical coverage of backward ellipsis is smaller than that of forward ellipsis (well-suited for the PhD project).

Empirically, both projects address the complete range of ellipsis constructions that have been discovered so far (sluicing, stripping, (speudo-)gapping, fragments, verb phrase ellipsis, comparative deletion, noun phrase ellipsis). Data will be collected (a) from the literature, (b) via native speaker consultation and (c) from available corpora, and will be made available in a database. The theoretical framework of research will be the principles-and-parameters and the minimalist theory of generative syntax.

### **2.1. Postdoc project: Focus in forward ellipsis**

The postdoc project addresses the relation between ellipsis and focus by studying (a)symmetries between forward ellipsis and non-elliptical constructions in languages. The research questions are:

- Question (i) What kind of properties do focus remnants have?  
Question (ii) What kind of focus strategies do we find in the marking of remnants?  
Question (iii) Do available focus strategies determine the availability of ellipsis types?

Answering Question (i): The focus nature of remnants in forward ellipsis

To establish whether focus remnants have as many subtypes as focus in non-elliptical sentences (Hypothesis I) new data will be collected from the complete array of ellipsis constructions featuring forward ellipsis in our target languages. The focal properties of the ellipsis remnants in these languages will be identified, classified and compared to the types of focus in full sentences. This is desirable, because focus is a diverse phenomenon: Various subtypes of focus can be distinguished according to syntactic, interpretive and prosodic properties (É.Kiss 1998, Molnár and Winkler 2006). It is currently unclear which of these types ellipsis remnants instantiate. There is some indication that the remnant can be contrastive focus, new information focus or contrastive topic in English (Merchant 2001, 2004, Gengel 2006), but we need to study if these types are attested cross-linguistically, too, and which ellipsis context selects for which type. Languages where the various types of focus and topics types are marked by different means, like Hungarian (É.Kiss 1987,1998, Lipták 2001, to appear, Molnár 2002,) will play a key role in establishing the variation in ellipsis. This will result in a fine-grained classification of focal remnant types, specifying syntactic, prosodic and interpretive properties. Special attention will be given to unexpected asymmetries between properties of focal constituents in complete and elliptical sentences, like exhaustivity. Hungarian focus fronting has exhaustive interpretation in full sentences (Szabolcsi 1981), but not in gapping:

- (6) a. Péter **Júliát** hívta meg.  
Péter Júlia-acc invited preverb  
'It was Júlia who Péter invited (and nobody else).'
- b. János Marit hívta meg, **Péter** meg **Júliát**.  
János Mari-acc invited preverb Péter on.the.other.hand Júlia-acc  
'János invited Mari, and Péter Júlia (next to possible others).'

While (6b) lacks exhaustivity, contrastivity is necessarily part of the meaning (Gengel 2006). We will investigate how these ingredients of meaning are related to each other (and the semantic focus conditions on ellipsis, Rooth 1992) and how they influence the syntactic expression of the remnant. This line of research will contribute to research on contrast, and its relation to focus and topic (Molnár 2002, Molnár and Winkler 2006).

Answering Question (ii): The marking of remnants in forward ellipsis

In the second step the marking of focus remnants will be researched. Are they marked by the same variety of focus marking strategies as focus in full sentences? Preliminary investigation shows that the answer seems to be no: Remnants cannot be in-situ focus phrases, i.e. words, phrases only marked by prosodic means. In languages with only this type of focus, like Japanese or Korean, there is no stripping or sluicing for example (Fukaya and Hoji 1999). Languages that have both an in-situ and a movement option, like Farsi, necessarily use the movement strategy in elliptical contexts like sluicing (Toosarvandani 2007). A similar conclusion emerges from the study of ellipsis in smaller domains, like noun phrase ellipsis: the remnant here also undergoes movement (Corver and van Koppen 2007). These facts seem to indicate that of the available focus marking strategies, languages use movement in ellipsis (Hypothesis II). We will examine if this generalization holds cross-linguistically for all types of ellipsis constructions. Special attention needs to be paid to (a) clefting, which is available in the formation of focus

remnants (Nevins, Rodrigues and Vicente 2007) but might not involve movement, and (b) verb phrase ellipsis that does not obviously require movement either (Johnson 2001). It needs to be seen if the latter ellipsis type constitutes an exception as a result that it involves a different syntactic mechanism of ellipsis (the ellipsis site containing a silent pronominal category as opposed to PF-deleted syntactic structure (Lobeck 1995, Winkler 2005)). If Hypothesis II is on the right track, we will turn to the question what property of ellipsis it follows from, in particular, whether it is due to the mechanism of forward ellipsis. If deletion affects constituents only (Lasnik 1999, 2001, Merchant 2001, Johnson to appear), this might force movement of the remnant out of the ellipsis site.

Answering Question (iii): The correlation between focus strategies and forward ellipsis types

With the syntax of focus remnants in place, the precise interaction between focus and ellipsis will be studied from a cross-linguistic perspective. In light of the generally accepted hypothesis that ellipsis makes use of the same syntactic representations as fully pronounced sentences (Ross 1969, Hankamer 1979, Merchant 2001, van Craenenbroeck 2004, Winkler 2005, Johnson to appear, Merchant to appear), it is expected that the availability of ellipsis strategies in languages is determined by the availability of focus strategies (Hypothesis III). If Hypothesis II is correct, this furthermore means that forward ellipsis is only licensed in languages that employ movement in the expression of focus. Indication for this comes from sluicing in Russian, Hungarian, Romanian or Gungbe. In these languages focus marking involves movement, with the result that sluicing is allowed with lexical focus (and not only with question phrases as in English) (van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006):

- (7) Mè dé wá, àmón má nyó en ní **Kofi wè.** (Gungbe)  
someone comebut I-neg know it if Kofi focus.marker  
'Someone came, but I don't know if (it was) Kofi.'

We will investigate if this generalization is valid cross-linguistically. Spanish, a language with special word order for focus questions this generalization: the counterpart of (7) is ungrammatical. We will consider if this is because focus movement in this language is motivated not by syntactic, but by prosodic requirements (Zubizarreta 1998).

A different kind of counterexample to Hypothesis III comes from English. While this language does not allow focus movement in non-elliptical sentences, it has that in some elliptical sentences. For example, the lower remnant in (pseudo-)gapping in English is moved to a sentence-internal contrastive focus position (Jayaseelan 2001, Winkler 2005, Gengel 2006, but see Lasnik 1999, Takahashi 2004 against such an analysis), a movement that is not available in full sentences:

- (8) Mary will buy a dog for Bobby, and Bill will **a cat**<sub>i</sub> buy ~~t<sub>i</sub>~~ for Bobby.  
(9) \*Bill will **a cat**<sub>i</sub> buy t<sub>i</sub> for Bobby.

Similar exceptional movement is also allowed in English fragment answers (Merchant 2003, 2004). Are these otherwise non-available movements exceptionally licensed by ellipsis? Some approaches deny that focus movement is responsible for producing ellipsis in English; instead, they claim that normal syntax is rich enough to provide the necessary structures for ellipsis, though this is masked by procedures that translate these structures to strings of words (Richards 2001, Takahashi 2004). Contrary to such accounts our hypothesis is that forward ellipsis licenses an exceptional (movement) focus strategy that is not available in complete sentences (Hypothesis IV). In line with current thinking (Merchant 2001, Lasnik 2001, van Craenenbroeck and Lipták to appear), we will investigate if this is because ellipsis rescues the otherwise illegitimate focus movement, due to the fact that it eliminates the source of ungrammaticality inside the ellipsis site at

PF (i.e. not pronouncing the ungrammatical element results in well-formedness).

## 2.2. PhD project: Focus in backward ellipsis

Backward ellipsis has a prominent place in the project, firstly, because the focal properties of remnants in backward ellipsis appear to be different from those in forward ellipsis and secondly, because backward ellipsis has received even less attention than forward ellipsis in the literature. Besides building up the empirical base similarly to the postdoc project, the PhD project addresses the following research questions about backward ellipsis:

- Question (iv) How do remnants in backward ellipsis differ from those in forward ellipsis and from focus constituents in non-elliptical sentences? Do focus strategies determine the availability of backward ellipsis in a language?
- Question (v) What is the mechanism of backward ellipsis?

Answering Question (iv): (A)symmetries between backward ellipsis, forward ellipsis and non-elliptical sentences

Preliminary investigations show that backward ellipsis allows for much fewer types of focal remnants than forward ellipsis. Stripping is impossible in backward ellipsis, but allowed in forward ellipsis in English (Merchant 2003; the same applies to pseudo-gapping, Levin 1979):

- (10) a. I talked to Mary, but not to Bill. (Forward stripping)  
b. \*Not to Bill, but I talked to Mary. (Backward stripping)

Hungarian, on the other hand, which has focus movement allows more types of backward ellipsis than English: backward stripping is grammatical.

- (11) B el aval nem besz eltem, de Marival besz eltem.  
Bill-with not I.talked but Mari-with I.talked  
'I talked to Mari, but not to B ela.'  
(Backward stripping)

This suggests that in the case of backward ellipsis there is a strict correlation between the availability of focus movement and ellipsis (Hypothesis III, IV): ellipsis is only licensed if focus movement is available in the language. We will investigate if this generalization can capture the behaviour of other languages with different focus marking, taking into consideration typological (VO-OV word order) differences between languages (Ross 1970) as well. As a second step, the role of focus in backward ellipsis will be studied from the point of view of parallelism effects. It has been noticed that backward ellipsis differs from forward ellipsis in this respect: It requires that the elliptical and non-elliptical clauses be syntactically, semantically and phonologically *parallel* to each other (B anr eti 2001, F ery and Hartmann 2005). To explain why this is so, we hypothesize that focus and parallelism interact: focus forces a parallel phonological organization of the two clauses due to its eradicating stress pattern. Aside from investigating this hypothesis, our research will attempt to integrate parallelism in grammatical theory.

Answering Question (v): The mechanism of backward ellipsis

Having established the distinct role of focus in backward and forward ellipsis, the next step investigates why the two types differ. Is the mechanism of ellipsis different? Or is it the same, with the differences following from other factors (e.g., structural position of the ellipsis site or the antecedent, etc.)? According to Wilder (1997), the former is correct: backward ellipsis has an altogether different mechanism. Evidence for this comes from

the fact that backward ellipsis requires strict identity between the ellipsis site and its licenser (cf. 12a) and allows for non-constituency of the missing material (cf. 12b), neither of which characterizes forward ellipsis (cf. 13a,b):

- (12) a. John said that **I** ~~love jazz~~ and Mary said that {**we** love jazz / \***she** loves jazz}.  
b. John looked a word with **ten** ~~letters up~~, and Mary looked a word with **twenty** letters up.
- (13) a. \*John said that **I** love jazz and Mary said that **we** ~~love jazz~~.  
b. \*John looked a word with **ten** letters up, and Mary looked a word with **twenty** ~~letters up~~.

These facts suggest an account of backward ellipsis in terms of non-pronunciation of PF-identical material in the phonological component (Wilder 1997). But this cannot be the whole story. The identity requirement illustrated in (12a) appears to be looser in some languages: agreement and finiteness mismatches are allowed in backward ellipsis for many speakers of Hungarian (Bartos 2001, Bánréti 2001). This suggests that a PF-identity analysis cannot be on the right track cross-linguistically. After charting out the limits of variation in identity, the project will investigate the mechanism of backward ellipsis in different languages, also in relation to right node raising and possible analyses thereof (e.g. Abels 2004).

### Innovation

This project is innovative in that it will broaden both the empirical base and the theoretical scope of focus and ellipsis research, contributing novel discoveries to both. The project is *empirically* innovative because it involves a much broader range of ellipsis phenomena than hitherto considered, by including the study of typologically distinct languages, both concerning backward and forward ellipsis. This will result in a typologically relevant sample of ellipsis constructions, made available in a database. The project is also novel *theoretically*, in that it systematically investigates the interaction between focus and ellipsis for the first time. It tests the novel claim that the variation in ellipsis is determined by the variation found in the marking of focus due to the fact that ellipsis remnants are focus items and languages vary in the expression of focus.

### Plan of work

The postdoc and the PhD will meet weekly for supervision and discussion of their progress. They will organize a reading group on focus and ellipsis for their institute as well. The project results will be presented at (inter)national conferences and at a special conference on ellipsis to be organized in 2011, as well as in articles in peer-reviewed international journals. LUCL is a perfect place for researching focus and ellipsis, both concerning theoretical and empirical embedding. The project will co-operate with specialists on focus and ellipsis (Lisa Cheng, Jenny Doetjes, Crit Cremers), specialists on Bantu languages (Leston Buell, Maarten Mous) and native speakers at the Department of African Linguistics (Felix Ameka). We will carry out co-authored research with specialists of the external advisory board (Enoch Aboh (Gungbe), Malte Zimmermann (Hausa) and Luis Vicente (Spanish)).

year	mths	postdoc	PhD student
2008	08 -12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• preparation of project (orientation, reading)</li> <li>• literature research, determining languages of study</li> </ul>	—
2009	01 -12	Question (i): focus nature of remnants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• data collection</li> <li>• properties remnants, variation</li> <li>• work on articles, presentations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• coursework in graduate program</li> <li>• participation in graduate program activities</li> <li>• literature research</li> </ul>
2010	01- 12	Question (ii): focus strategies in ellipsis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• data collection</li> <li>• syntax of focus remnants</li> <li>• mechanism of ellipsis</li> <li>• work on articles, presentations</li> </ul> Question (iii): variation in ellipsis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (a)symmetries in focus strategies and ellipsis</li> </ul>	Question (iv): focus remnants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• data collection</li> <li>• (a)symmetries with forward ellipsis and non-elliptical focus</li> <li>• analysis of parallelism</li> </ul> Question (v): mechanism of ellipsis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• variation in identity</li> <li>• PF-effects</li> </ul>
2011	01 -12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• correlating focus and ellipsis variation</li> <li>• ellipsis repair</li> <li>• work on articles, presentations</li> <li>• conference organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• formulating questions, hypotheses</li> <li>• dissertation outline, drafts of first chapters</li> <li>• conference organization</li> </ul>
2012	01 -12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• synthesis of the results for backward and forward ellipsis</li> <li>• syntax of ellipsis</li> <li>• implementation of the overall results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• formulation, testing final hypotheses</li> <li>• final write-up of dissertation</li> </ul>
2013	01- 07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• writing of articles</li> </ul>	—

## 2e. Literature references

- Abels, K. (2004) Right node raising: ellipsis or across the board movement. *Proceedings of NELS 34*. 45-59. GLSA Publications, Amherst, MA.
- Bánrétí, Z. (2001) Multiple lexical selection and parallelism in Hungarian VP ellipsis. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 48: 1-3, 25-58.
- Bartos, H. (2001) Sound-form non-insertion and the direction of ellipsis. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 48:1-3, 3-24.
- Büring, D. (2006) Towards a typology of focus realization. To appear in the proceedings of Tokyo 2005 workshop on focus.
- Corver, N. and M. van Koppen (2007) Let's focus on noun phrase ellipsis. Ms. Utrecht University.
- van Craenenbroeck, J. (2004) Ellipsis in Dutch dialects. LOT dissertation series 96. LOT.
- van Craenenbroeck, J. and A. Lipták (2006) The cross-linguistic syntax of sluicing. Evidence from Hungarian relatives. *Syntax* 9:3, 1-27.
- Féry, C. and K. Hartmann (2005) The focus and prosodic structure of German right node raising and gapping. *The Linguistic Review* 22. 69-116.
- Fukaya, T. and H. Hoji (1999) Stripping and sluicing in Japanese and some implications. In: S. Bird, A. Carnie, J.D. Haugen and P. Norquest (eds.) *Proceedings of WCCFL 18*. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA. 145-158.
- Gengel, K. (2006) Contrastivity and ellipsis. In L. Mackie, and A. McNay (eds), *Proceedings of the LingO - University of Oxford Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics*. Oxford. Available at: <http://www.ling-phil.ox.ac.uk/events/lingo-/proceedings.html>.
- Hankamer, J. (1979) *Deletion in Coordinate Structures*. Garland Publishing, New York/London.
- Hartmann, K. (2001) Right node raising and gapping. Interface conditions on prosodic deletion. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Jayaseelan, K. A. (2001) IP-internal topic and focus phrases. *Studia Linguistica* 55:1, 39-75.
- Johnson, K. (2001) What VP ellipsis can do, what it can't, but not why. In M. Baltin and Ch. Collins (eds) *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*. Blackwell Publishers, 439-479.
- Johnson, K. (to appear) Topics in ellipsis. Cambridge University Press.

- É. Kiss, K. (1987) Configurationality in Hungarian. Akadémiai kiadó, Budapest.
- É. Kiss, K. (1995) Discourse configurational languages. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- É. Kiss, K. (1998) Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74, 245-273.
- Lasnik, H. (1999) Pseudogapping puzzles. In S. Lappin and E. Benmamoun (eds), *Fragments*. 141-174. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Lasnik, H. (2001) When can you save a structure by destroying it? *Proceedings of NELS 31*, 301-320. GLSA Publications, Amherst, MA.
- Levin, N. (1979) Main verb ellipsis in spoken English. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Lipták, A. (2001) On the Syntax of Wh-items in Hungarian. LOT dissertation series 45. LOT.
- Lipták, A. (to appear) The structure of the topic field in Hungarian. In P. Benincà and N. Munaro (eds), *Mapping the left periphery*. Oxford University Press.
- Lobeck, A. (1995) Ellipsis: functional heads, licensing and identification. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Merchant, J. (2001) The syntax of silence. *Oxford studies in theoretical linguistics* 1. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Merchant, J. (2003) Remarks on stripping. Ms. Available at: <http://home.uchicago.edu/~merchant/pubs/stripping.pdf>
- Merchant, J. (2004) Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 661-738.
- Merchant, J. (to appear) Sluicing: cross-linguistic explorations. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Molnár, V. (2002) Contrast — from a contrastive perspective. In H. Hasselgård, S. Johansson, B. Behrens and C. Fabricius-Hansen (eds), *Information Structure in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. 147-161. Rodopi, Amsterdam/New York.
- Molnár, V. and S. Winkler (eds) (2006) *The Architecture of Focus*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.
- Nevins, A. C. Rodrigues and L. Vicente (2007). Preposition stranding under sluicing. To appear in *Proceedings of Going Romance*.
- Richards, N. (2001) Movement in languages. Interactions and architectures. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Rooth, M. (1992) A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75-116.
- Ross, J. R. (1969) Guess who? In R. Binnick, A. Davison, G. Green and J. Morgan (eds), *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 252-286. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago.
- Ross, J. R. (1970) Gapping and the Order of Constituents. In Bierwisch, M, and K. Heidolph (eds), *Progress in Linguistics*. 245-259. Mouton de Gruyter/Den Haag.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1981) The semantics of topic-focus articulation. In J. Groenendijk, T. Janssen and M. Stokhof (eds), *Formal Methods in the Study of Language*. 513-541. Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam.
- Takahashi, S. (2004) Pseudo-gapping and cyclic linearization. *Proceedings of NELS 34*, 571-585. GLSA Publications, Amherst, MA.
- Toosarvandani, M. (2007) Wh-movement and syntax of sluicing. Ms. University of Berkeley.
- Zubizarreta, M. L. (1998) *Prosody, Focus and Word Order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wilder, Ch. (1997) Some properties of ellipsis in coordination. In A. Alexiadou and R. A. Hall (eds), *Studies on Universal Grammar and Typological Variation*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Winkler, S. (2005) *Ellipsis and Focus in Generative Grammar*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.

### International advisory board for the project

<u>Country</u>	<u>Department/University</u>	<u>Research Partner</u>
Belgium	Catholic University Brussels	Jeroen van Craenenbroeck
France	Paris 8, CNRS Sorbonne Nouvelle, CNRS	Hans Obenauer Prof. Georges Rebuschi
Germany	University of Potsdam/ZAS University of Tübingen	Prof. Malte Zimmermann Prof. Susanne Winkler
Hungary	Research Institute for Linguistics, Budapest	Prof. István Kenesei Balázs Surányi
Italy	University of Padua	Cecilia Poletto
Norway	Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim	Christopher Wilder
The Netherlands	University of Amsterdam	Enoch Aboh
US	University of Massachusetts Amherst University of California, Santa Cruz	Prof. Rajesh Bhatt Luis Vicente