

Langley made a house-fortress, which was designed to protect them, but it was the reason for their loneliness and death. Therefore, the house in the novel is also a kind of character, the condition of which affected the physical and mental state of brothers. J. C. Oates states that "Doctorow's Langley is corrosively eloquent, a modern-day Diogenes, or a prophet out of the Hebrew Bible; his cynicism suggests the later, embittered years of America's most popular and beloved writer, Mark Twain" [9, p. 80].

By the documentary evidence, in 1947 in New York City Langley Collyer fell into the trap of trash that was his own creation, and did not manage to carry dinner to his brother, who died from starvation. Their house was demolished and Collyer Brothers Park was created there. Because of creepy atmosphere it's forbidden to walk with children in the park. Brothers were met by the notorious fame of "hermits of Harlem" [11, p. 1].

This study allows to determine in E. L. Doctorow's "Homer and Langley" such main issues as: the role of universal moral values in the world; such as love, care and humanity; problems of moral crisis of society; the issues of reclusion, estrangement from the world; the nature of eccentric people, outsiders; the mystery of the human mind and destiny. The originality of E. L. Doctorow's prose, meaningful depth of his works, variability and diversity of characters can be used as a subject for further research.

## REFERENCES

1. Clayton, J. Radical Jewish humanism: The vision of E. L. Doctorow / John Clayton // Essays and Conversations. – P. 109 – 119.
2. Critchly, S. The ethics of deconstruction: Derrida and Levinas / Simon Critchly. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1992. – 289 p.
3. Hassan, I. The Expense of Spirit in Postmodern Times: between nihilism and belief / Ihab Hassan // The Georgia Review, 1997. – Vol. 51, №1. – P. 9 – 26.
4. White, H.: The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation / Hayden White. – Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987. – 244 p.
5. Henry, A.M. Problematized Narratives: History as Fiction in E. L. Doctorow's "Billy Bathgate" / A.M. Henry // Critique. – 1997. – Vol. 39.1. – P. 32 – 40.
6. Kakutani M. How did they end up that way? / M. Kakutani // New York Times. – 2009. – August 31. – P. 1.
7. Schillinger, L. The odd couple / L. Schillinger // New York Times. – 2009. – September 8. – P. 7.
8. Doctorow, E.L. Homer and Langley / E.L. Doctorow. – N. Y.: Random House, 2009. – 224 p.
9. Oats, J.C. Love and Squalor / J.C. Oats // The New Yorker. – 2009. – September 7. – P. 80.
10. Alterman, E. How E.L. Doctorow Does It / E. Alterman // Daily Beast. – 2009. – September 6. – P. 3–4.
11. Lidz, F. The Paper Chase / F. Lidz // New York Times. – 2003. – October 26 – P. 1.

UDC 811.112

## ELLIPSIS AS A NORM OF ENGLISH INFORMAL LANGUAGE

ALIAKSANDRA KRASNIAKOVA, VOLHA KRASOUSKAYA

Polotsk State University, Belarus

*The article deals with the analysis of ellipsis in informal style; a special attention is focused on the phenomenon of conversational English. The research provides an account of the different contexts, both linguistic and situational ones, which affect its use. The article is intended to conduct a linguistic analysis of the famous feature film "Runaway bride", showing how ellipsis, in its different types, functions in colloquial speech.*

We have referred to sentences without providing any definition of a sentence. The question "What is a sentence?" is more difficult than it might appear. In traditional school grammar, the basic pattern of a sentence in English is a subject–predicate unit, that is, it has two principal positions: that of the subject and of the predicate. The sentence does not start without a subject and predicate in it, unless we are dealing with ellipsis and elliptical sentences.

It is clear that spontaneous spoken language differs in important ways from the standard written form. 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 and such sentences are called elliptical.

E.g.: – *Did you study linguistics?*

– *Yes, I did [Yes, I did study linguistics]*

But the omitted items are usually recoverable from:

- 1) the **linguistic** context (the actual language surrounding an utterance or sentence);
- 2) the **situational** context (the recovery of omitted items is based on *non-verbal context* and *cognitive process*).

Since the missing parts are easily restored ("understood"), elliptical sentences are treated as two-member sentences.

In terms of traditional grammar, elliptical sentences are generally identified as sentences with the subject or predicate missing. Nowadays some linguists take a broader view on ellipsis. They think that a sentence is elliptical if any part of the sentence is missing (primary or secondary). This view was shared by B. Ilyish and L.S. Barkhudarov.

We define the elliptical sentence as a sentence where, for reasons of economy, emphasis or style, a part of it is omitted. Ellipsis here refers only to the structural elements of the sentence, not the informational ones. This means that those words can be omitted, because they have only grammatical, structural relevance, and do not carry any new relevant information. Elliptical sentence is a shorter form of sentence where some words have been omitted, but it retains the same meaning. It is used so that we can avoid unnecessary repeated words. We will apply this term to any sentence of this kind, no matter what part or parts of it have been left out [1, p. 252].

The other reason for ellipsis is that by omitting shared items, attention is focused on the new material as in the following example:

E.g.: *–Have you spoken to him?*

*– [I have] not yet [spoken to him]*

The grammar of English provides a broad array of elliptical sentences, where what is communicated goes beyond what is explicitly stated. It is generally agreed that ellipsis is governed by an identity condition, to the effect that an identical copy of the antecedent is "reconstructed" at the ellipsis site. At the content level of the message communicated, it is quite understandable, but on the form level of the language it is impossible to be fixed.

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 terms of structure the following types of elliptical sentences are single out:

a) omission of the subject;

E.g.: *Hope to see you soon.*

b) omission of the constructions "there is", "there are";

E.g.: *Too many mistakes, I am afraid.*

c) omission of the auxiliary verb in the question;

E.g.: *You see it?*

d) omission of the subject and auxiliary verb;

E.g.: *See?*

e) omission of the subject and the link-verb;

E.g.: *Glad to see you again.*

L.S. Barkhudarov suggests the following classification of elliptical sentences which is based on the way of their explication. By explication we understand the replacement of the zero alternant of this or that word by the explicit one. There are two kinds of explication:

1. **Syntagmatically restored elliptical sentences.** In these sentences the missing parts are restored from the context or situation.

E.g.: *Sam was in her blood. Had always been. Would always be.*

Subject [Sam] is left out in the second and third sentences.

2. **Paradigmatically restored elliptical sentences.** Here the missing part is restored on analogy with the existing 2-member complete sentences.

E.g.: *– Married? [Are you married?]*

*– Widower, sir. [I am a widower, sir.][2, p. 180]*

Elliptical sentences are typical of conversational English. In spoken English we often leave out the elements which can be easily understood. We rarely speak in the complete sentences that are often held to be the

ideal form of linguistic communication. Language is, in fact, full of gaps, because speakers and writers operate in contexts which allow bits of language to be understood rather than expressed.[3, p. 11]

Ellipsis gives us a chance to communicate efficiently: without ellipsis, communication would be tedious. And the main sphere of its usage is of course dialogue: it is here that one or more parts of a sentence are left out because they are either to be supplied from the preceding sentence (belonging to another speaker) or may be easily dispensed with. In the following dialogue, if all the parts were to be pronounced every time, the conversation would be quite repetitious.

E.g.: – *Did you study linguistics?*  
 – *Yes, I did. [Yes, I studied linguistics].*  
 – *Why did you study linguistics?*  
 – *[I studied linguistics] because I am interested in it.*

As ellipsis is clearly shown in the conversation. The famous feature film «Runaway bride» was taken as a base of studying the problem. It is full of dialogues. So we could see how ellipsis, in its different types, functions in colloquial speech. And it can also berevealed which parts of sentences are mostly left out in the speech of the characters.

By the method of a complete sample there were found 306 examples of elliptical sentences' usage in the film. Then we tried to classify the examples according to their structures and the way of their explication. According to L.S. Barkhudarov, elliptical sentences are divided into syntagmatically and paradigmatically restored.

The paradigmatically restored sentences have been found in characters' speech more often. 234 examples (76%) have been revealed. Here the full form is recoverable simply through the knowledge of the grammatical structure.

E.g.: *Just keep your eye on the ball.*  
*I would love to give you this. Believe me, I would.*  
*You're jailbait, Dennis. Go away. Go away.*  
 (In the sentences personal pronoun 'you' is omitted).  
 E.g.: – *Satisfied?*[instead of 'Are you satisfied?']  
*See? Remember? [Do you see? Do you remember?]*

The syntagmatically restored elliptical sentences have been found 72 in number (24%). Here the missing parts are restored from the context or situation.

E.g.: *She got to you, too. Like a moth to a flame.*  
*Ellie, what went wrong? With us, with the two of us, I mean.*  
*I am a reporter. Not quite a novelist.*  
*Very cold, isn't it?*  
 E.g.: – *I think you could sell these lamps in New York. – Maybe someday.*  
 E.g.: – *How was the wedding? – Shorter than we planned.*

We have also found all the types of the elliptical sentences that are singled out in the classification according to their structure.

- 1) There are 143 examples of subject's omission (47%).  
 E.g.: – *Well, I'd better be moving. Got a lot of work to do today.*  
 – *See you later.*  
 – *Bye, Mrs. Pressman. Thank you.*
- 2) There are 104 cases of omission of the subject and the link-verb (34%).  
 E.g.: – *How is he?*  
 – *Quiet pleased with life.*
- 3) There are 26 sentences with omission of the auxiliary verb in the question (8%).  
 E.g.: – *You nervous?*  
 – *You want the truth? You want the facts? I got 'em.*
- 4) There are 21 cases of omission of the constructions "there is", "there are" (7%).  
 E.g.: – *Nothing but net.*  
 – *So many people here.*

5) The cases with ellipsis of the subject and auxiliary verb are more infrequent. And there are only 12 sentences (4%).

E.g.: – *See?*  
 – *Want to hear something funny?*

As it has been mentioned above ellipsis, as a rhetorical figure of speech, is the omission in a sentence of one or more words which would be needed to express the sense completely. Nevertheless, elliptical sentences are perfectly grammatical and speakers always know what the missing material corresponds to. On the basis of the Economy Principle ('Be quick and easy'), the use of ellipsis reduces the amount of time and effort, avoiding redundancy and repetition. This is why there is a great deal of ellipsis in conversation. The conversational dialogues are full of it and if ellipsis weren't used, the sentences we pronounce would become gradually longer as conversation progressed.

This phenomenon has played an important role in revealing the specifics of spoken language. It allows avoiding repetition, achieving a more acceptable economy of statement and shedding light on the new material.

#### REFERENCES

1. Бархударов, Л.С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка / Л.С. Бархударов. – М.: Высш. шк., 1966. – 199 с.
2. Пыш, В.А. The Structure of Modern English / В.А. Пыш. – Л.: Просвещение, 1971. – 365 с.
3. Wilson, P. Mind the Gap: Ellipsis and Stylistic Variation in Spoken and Written English / P. Wilson. – Pearson Education, 2000. – 239 p.

UDC 821.111(043.3)

#### THE VIKING AGE AND THE SCANDINAVIAN INFLUENCE ON ENGLISH-SCOTTISH BALLADS

**YAUHEN PAPAKUL, ALEXANDER GUGNIN**  
**Polotsk State University, Belarus**

*The Viking age had very important significance for Great Britain. During that time a lot of Scandinavian settlements were created on the territory of Albion; Old Danish and Old Norse influenced the language which we call nowadays English greatly. And even the national British heroic epic poem "Beowulf" has the Scandinavian origin.*

To understand the peculiarity of any literary phenomenon it is vitally important to take into account not only the period of its existence but also the historical and cultural context that preceded it.

Speaking about English and Scottish ballads, one of the best experts on balladry of the 20<sup>th</sup> century William J. Entwistle notes, that the national element cannot be separated in them. Though they can be broadly distinguished. That is why he gives a list of "typically" English or Scottish ballads. So, English ballads are typically:

1) the Robin Hood pieces from middle England (despite three of about 42 ballads about the famous archer have the Scottish origin);

2) the historical narratives of the type of "Chevy Chase" and "Durham Field";

3) picaresque and romantic pieces.

The Scottish ballads are, correspondingly:

1) supernatural narratives;

2) tragic love ballads;

3) Border ballads, and the later ballads of feud in Aberdeenshire and round about.

English and Scottish ballads differ in the way of rendering as well. The English pieces are recitatives and typically show reliance on France, when they have international material. The Scottish ones have a single or double refrain in many cases, and are closely associated with Scandinavian "viser" designed to be danced. Whether they were themselves danced there seems not sufficient evidence to determine. The Scottish ballads are closely linked to Scandinavia, and the ports of Aberdeenshire and Fife must have been marts of the traffic [1, p. 230].

And here we touch upon the main issue of the article: the reasons of this strong Scandinavian influence on English-Scottish balladry. Not the French influence, taking into account all the events after 1066, that brought cardinal changes in all spheres of British life; and not, for example, the German influence, though geographically the distance between Great Britain on the one hand and Germany and Scandinavia on the other hand is practically the same. To find the answer to this question let us consider thoroughly some essential facts and important historic events before the period of ballad flourishing in the 14<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> centuries.