

ELLIPSIS IN DIALOGS OF TWO AMERICAN NOVELS

Tri Pujiati

ABSTRACT

*This research attempts to show the study of grammar which is limited only on the use of ellipsis as the way to omit the pieces of sentences in dialog. This study shows that the omission of parts occurs in dialog by applying ellipsis theory of Halliday (1994), Biber et al (1999) and Sinclair (ed.) (2000). This study uses sources of data from two American novels entitled *The Relic* by Evelyn Anthony and *The Lonesome Gods* by Louis L'amour. The analysis methods conducted in this study are (a) to analyze the use of ellipsis in dialog and explain the parts of the sentence that are omitted (b) to analyze the function of ellipsis and the effect in written language. This study finds that the use of ellipsis functions to minimize the conversation, to avoid the use of the same words and to omit the words that have been spoken in questions. This study also shows that ellipsis may make the sentence to be ungrammatical in standard language.*

Key words: Grammar studies, Ellipsis, American novels

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The use of ellipsis in dialogs often happens in novels especially in American novels. People use to speak with elliptical sentences in spoken language when they speak to other people. Ellipsis is the way to omit word or words from a sentence when the meaning of the sentence can be understood. It is especially common in speech (Leech, Cruickshank and Ivanic 2006:141). Ellipsis often occurs in conversations when the speaker replies or asks the questions (Sinclair (ed.) 2000:399). It happens because the speaker wants to make the conversations shorter by deleting the parts or the elements of the sentence which can be understood by hearer. It has the aim to minimize the conversation without subtracting the meaning that wants to be spoken by speaker. Something that left unsaid but understood often happens in conversation (Halliday and Hasan in Amri 1993:17). The function of ellipsis is not only to minimize the conversation, but also to avoid the repeating of words in questions (Sinclair (ed.) 2000:399).

Speaking about ellipsis, this word comes from Latin, which has the meaning 'falling short' because part of their structure has been omitted (Exploring Language 2009). For instance,

A: Where are you going?

B: [I'm going] to Greymouth.

The words in B [I'm going] has been omitted in order to make the sentence shorter and to avoid the repeating question from speaker A.

The use of ellipsis in conversations or dialogs often happen in informal situation between close friends, family, brothers and sisters. The speaker usually omits parts of the sentence, for instance, subject, predicate, connector, auxiliary, pronoun, complement, preposition, object and adverb. In spoken language, the speaker and the hearer speak directly.

It means that when the speaker omits the elements of the clause when speaking, the hearer understands the meaning of the utterance that is spoken by speaker. According to Alwi *et al.* (in Isa 2006:19), in spoken language, the function of grammatical, such as subject, predicate, object, and the relation of the function can be omitted because the speaker and the hearer meet to each other. Moreover, there are constructional principles of spoken grammar in spoken language, one of them is syntactic non-clausal units, such as short answer, short question, abbreviation and vocatives (Biber *et al.* 1999:1066-1125). The principle of spoken grammar indicates that the use of ellipsis in spoken language is permitted. It is because in spoken language, people usually want to minimize conversation by deleting some words from the sentence that are understood by each other. This condition is very different with the use of ellipsis in written language. It is because in omitting a word or words from a sentence will make the sentence to be ungrammatical. For instance, *I and he in the class right now*. From the example, it is known that the subject of the sentence is *I* and *He* as a noun and must be followed by to be *are* because the subject more than one.

There are many American novels which use elliptical sentence in dialogs and narration. For instance in dialogs below,

A: "what is it?"

B: "a great treasure." (TR 30)

From the example above, the speaker wants to ask something to the other person and both of them can understand although there is part of speech that doesn't appear in front of the object. In this sentence, the speaker doesn't use auxiliary *it* and copula *be* in front of subject. In spoken language, elliptical sentence often happens especially in American novel. From the sentence, the subject of pronoun is *it* because the term refers to the thing (a great treasure). Because the subject pronoun is *it*, copula *be* that is used must be *is*.

There is an example of the ellipsis found in narration of the novel.

A man on foot, if he was careful. A faint sound of voices came, a laugh; they were right below us. Yet that one man with a rifle ... Maybe he could pin them down, scatter them, leave time for the riders to make it. (TLG 343).

In the example of narration above, the use of three dots (...) indicates for a pause or to show that words have been left out (Grammar Monster 2009).

After observing those cases, the writer conducts a study about the use of ellipsis in American novels to know the parts of sentence or clause that are usually omitted in conversations. Moreover, the writer analyzes the use of ellipsis in dialogs of American novels in terms of kinds, characteristics, functions, and effects of ellipsis.

The writer focuses only on the use of ellipsis in Evelyn Anthony's novel entitled *The Relic* which was published by Harper Collins Publishers (1991) in New York and Louis L'amour's novel entitled *The Lonesome Gods* which was published by Bantam Books (1983) in the United States of America. In addition, the writer also limits the analysis only in the dialogs which use ellipsis because the use of ellipsis in the dialog are clearer. Ellipsis also can be found in narration of the novels but the writer will not analyze the use of ellipsis in the narration because it will make this study to be wider and longer.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Review of Literature

Frank (1972:226) defines ellipsis as the kind of abridgment of "understood" words. She defines that the omission of words are necessary for the full of subject - predicate structure. Frank states that the omission can be in independent clause and dependent clause. In independent clause, can be seen from the example below, *He says he will finish the work on time (,) and he will*. In dependent clause can be seen from the example below, *She visits her parents whenever she can*.

Chomsky (1982:27) defines ellipsis as the elimination from consideration.

Ervin-Tripp (in Richards and Schmidt 1983:100) defines ellipsis as elliptical form often happens in action in direct or indirect object. For example in the data specified the direct object below, *now this one*. [i.e. Now look at this picture]. The sentence in the [] indicates that actually the speaker asks the hearer to look at the picture.

Azar (1989:288) states that the form of parallel structure, in which unnecessary words are omitted but are understood, is termed as ellipsis. The example below is about ellipsis in which the same words have been omitted,

Mary opened the door. Mary greeted her guests.

—————▶ *Mary opened the door and greeted her guests.*

Ellipsis is something that left unsaid but understood, Halliday and Hasan (in Amri 1993:17-18). They also divide ellipsis into three. They are nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis and clausal ellipsis.

Halliday (1994: 318) defines ellipsis as the following quotation,

A clause, or a part of a clause, or a part (usually including the lexical element) of a verbal or nominal group, may be presupposed at a subsequent place in the text by the device of positive omission – that is, by saying nothing, where something is required to make up the sense. Either the structure is simply left unfilled, as in *not* for *I will not wake him*, which is ellipsis properly so called; or else a place holding element is inserted to signal the gap, like the *do* in for *if I do*, which is referred to as substitution.

He also divides ellipsis in to three main contexts. These are (1) the clause, (2) the verbal group, and (3) the nominal group.

Biber *et al.* (1999:1099-1107) define ellipsis as the omission of word or words in order to avoid the repetition of words that have been spoken. They state that ellipsis happens in syntactical non-clausal units, elliptic phrasal non-clausal units and in clausal units. Elliptic replies, elliptic exclamation, elliptic question-and-answer sequences occur in syntactic non-clausal units.

Besides, ellipsis also occurs in clausal units. It often happens in conversation. In this term, ellipsis is classified in to three context, they are initial ellipsis, final ellipsis and medial ellipsis. In initial ellipsis, there are three kinds of ellipsis. These are ellipsis of subject, ellipsis of operator and ellipsis of subject and operator.

Ellipsis is leaving out of words (Sinclair (ed.) 2000: 396-400). He states that ellipsis is common be used by people because they prefer omit the words to repeat them. Ellipsis is commonly happens in conversation. It is used in replying, asking questions, and also agreement.

Leech, Cruickshank, and Ivanic (2006: 141) state that ellipsis refer to the way we omit words in grammar. For instance, *we went to Rome last year, and [we] really enjoyed it*.

They also state that ellipsis is especially common in speech. For example,

A: I suppose Kathy is still living in that same place

B: Yes, she is [still living in that same place]

From the example above, it can be concluded that ellipsis [] shows the link between the first sentence and the second one.

Exploring Language (2009) defines ellipsis as (Latin: “falling short”) because part of their structure has been omitted. For example:

A: *Where are you going?*

B: *[I'm going] to Greymouth.*

A: *When are you leaving?*

B: *[I'm leaving] early tomorrow morning.*

From the example above, the words in [I'm going] and [I'm leaving] have been omitted by speaker. Those words indicate the omission from the sentence.

Grammar Monster (2009) defines ellipsis as (...) three dots used for a pause or to show that words have been left out. Example:

- A. *A credit card stolen in London was used to pay for a Chinese meal five hours later...in Bangkok. (pause for effect)*
 B. *The brochure states: "The atmosphere is tranquil...and you cannot hear the trains." (words omitted)*

In this study, the writer is going to analyze the use of ellipsis in dialogs of novel Evelyn Anthony's *The Relic* and Louis L'amour's *The Lonesome Gods* by using ellipsis theories of Halliday (1994), Biber *et al.* (1999), and Sinclair ((ed.) 2000). Their theories will be used as theoretical framework in analyzing the data.

Theory from Halliday (1994)

Halliday (1994: 309) defines ellipsis as:

A clause, or a part of a clause, or a part (usually including the lexical element) of a verbal or nominal group, may be presupposed at a subsequent place in the text by the device of positive omission – that is, by saying nothing, where something is required to make up the sense. Either the structure is simply left unfilled, as in *not for I will not wake him*, which is ellipsis properly so called; or else a place holding element is inserted to signal the gap, like the *do* in *for if I do*, which is referred to as substitution.

Halliday (1994:318) divides Ellipsis in to three main contexts. They are (1) The clause, (2) The verbal group, and (3) The nominal group.

Ellipsis in the clause is related to mood, to the questions-answer process in dialogs. There are two kinds of ellipsis in the clause, they are yes / no ellipsis and WH- Ellipsis in whole clause and yes / no ellipsis and WH- Ellipsis in parts of the clause.

In a yes / no questions-answer sequence the answer may involve ellipsis of the whole clause, e.g.

- (+) Can you row?
 (-) `Yes. [I can row]

In yes / no question, the first clause in a pair is not necessarily a question, it may have any speech function, for instance,

- (+) Have another biscuit?
 (-) No, thank you. [I won't have another biscuit]

In a WH sequence the entire clause is usually omitted, except for the WH – element itself, or the item that is the response to the WH-element, for instance,

- (+) What did they draw?
 (-) Treacle. [They draw treacle]

As an alternative to the ellipsis of the whole clause, there may be ellipsis of just one part of it, the residue. For example:

- (+) Must a name mean something?
 (-) Of course it must. [mean something]

Sometimes in a WH- clause, or its response, the mood element is left in the only the residue is ellipsed. For example, with WH – subject

- (+) Who can untie this knot?
 (-) I can. [untie that knot]

Verbal group consists of finite plus predicator, it follows automatically that any clausal ellipsis in which the mood element is present but the residue omitted will involve ellipsis within the verbal group. There is no need to repeat the discussion of this phenomenon.

Substitution in the verbal group is by means of the verb *do*, which can substitute for any verb provided it is active not passive, except *be* or, in some context, *have*. The verb *do* will appear in the appropriate non-finite form (*do*, *doing*, *done*).

Let see the example below in order to understand the use of ellipsis in the verbal group,

- (+) Have the children gone to sleep?
- (-) I think they must have done.

Ellipsis in the nominal group is shown that an element other than the thing could function as head, for example any in *have some wine?*

- (-) I don't see any wine
- (-) There isn't any

Theory from Biber *et al.* (1999)

Biber *et al.* (2000:1099-1107) define ellipsis as the omission of word or words in order to avoid the repetition of words that have been spoken. They state that ellipsis happens in syntactical non-clausal units, elliptic phrasal non-clausal units and in clausal units. In conversation, ellipsis often happens in clausal units.

Ellipsis in syntactical non-clausal units is classified in to three. They are elliptic replies, elliptic question and answer sequences, and elliptic exclamation.

Elliptic replies often happen when the speaker replies to the other speaker by omitting a word or words. For example in dialog below,

- A: Where did you guys park?
- B: Right over here [*we parked* is omitted]

From the example above, it is clear that the speaker has omitted some of words. These are [*we and parked*]

Elliptic Question and Answer Sequences happen when the speaker wants to answer their questions, rather to proffer an answer to their own question, in the form of interrogative (Biber *et al.* 1999:1101). For instance in dialog below,

- A: Did you talk to <unclear>.
- B: No, **why, did she call?**

In other cases, the speaker likes to uses the second interrogative as the proffered answer. For instance, *where can I get parchment paper? An art store?*

Reducing of exclamation clause has typically ellipsis of a pronoun subject and form of the verb (Biber *et al.* 1999: 1102). In this term, the actual of subject is determined only by the context. For example, *what a sweet child* is the form of *what a sweet child he/she is*.

Elliptic phrasal non-clausal units on context for their interpretation is most occur in the elliptical replies to questions (Biber *et al.* 1999: 1104). For instance,

- A: Can I have a drink?
- B: Yeah, what would you like?
- A: I would like strawberry.
- B : < ---- > With or without ice?
- A : < ---- >With < ---- >.

Ellipsis in clausal units is classified in to three contexts, they are initial ellipsis, final ellipsis and medial ellipsis.

Initial ellipsis is ellipsis that occurs at the beginning of turn, clause, or (occasionally) a non - clausal unit. It is classified in to three. They are ellipsis in subject, ellipsis of operator, and ellipsis of subject and operator (Biber *et al.*. 1999:1104 -1105).

Ellipsis of subject often happens in conversation when the subject of declarative clause is omitted, normally at the start of turn. For instance,

- A: Are your parents well off?
- B : < ---- > depends on what you call well off really [*it* is omitted]

American people usually speak don't know as *dunno*, and in conversation it often happens in omission of subject before *dunno*.

- A: And what do you think she'll say?
- B : < ---- > *dunno* [*I* is omitted]

Ellipsis of operator occurs in conversation in yes-no interrogative and usually auxiliary or to be is omitted. Let see the example below,

Oh < ---- > you serious [*are* is omitted]
 < ---- > That's too early for you? [*Is* is omitted]
 < ---- > Your Granny Iris get here? [*did* is omitted]

Ellipsis of subject and operator occurs in which subject and operator usually omitted in conversation. It happens at the beginning of declarative or interrogative clause.

In declarative clauses can be seen from dialogs below,

A: I love French beaches
 B: Yeah < ---- > telling me. [*you're* is omitted]

In interrogative clauses can be seen in examples below,

< ---- > know what I mean? [*do* and *you* are omitted]
 Why aren't you working? < ---- > Got a day off? [*have you* omitted]

Biber *et al.* (1999: 1106) give the explanation that final ellipsis occurs in clause in which the omission of any words following the operator, i.e. the finite auxiliary of copula. For example in the dialogs below,

A: I suppose Kathy is still living in that same place.'
 B: Yeah, she **is** < ---- > [*Living in that same place* is omitted]

There is an example of ellipsis which closes to medial ellipsis rather than final ellipsis. However, the omission of the main verb and complement, as the characteristic of final ellipsis close to final ellipsis. For instance in dialog below,

A1: I'm not going out with her at her moment
 B1: Ah!
 A2: **But I should be** < ---- > by around Tuesday night. [*going out with her* is omitted]

Ellipsis can arise in dialogs because the speaker repeats one term that has been said by other speaker, let see dialog below,

A: You said by Monday last time.
 B: **Did I** < ---- >? Well I lied. [*Say by Monday last time* is omitted]
 C: Yeah, **you did** < ---- > [*say by Monday last time* is omitted]

The other kinds of ellipsis in final ellipsis are ellipsis after an infinitive to and after a WH-word. Let see the example below,

A: Oh dear! - Take me home!
 B: **I'd love to** < ---- > [*take you home* is omitted]
 A: Yeah, I think stealing is the biggest thing.
 B: cos that what left's, unclear. Was doing. Either that or drugs. I'm not sure which < ---- > [*is the biggest thing?* Is omitted]
 But she completely lost it. I and I still don't really know **why or how** < ---- > [*she lost it* is omitted]

Biber *et al.* (1999: 1107) state that medial ellipsis often happens in which operator (e.g. the finite auxiliary or copula) is omitted. For instance, *you better* from *you'd better* (should is omitted).

In medial ellipsis, it is usually common in using of had better, *have got to* are usually spoken by *gotta* and *be going to* is often spoken by *gonna*. For instance, Yeah dude, I < ---- > start working. In this example, it is known that the speaker has omitted *am* as to be for *I* in simple present.

In American English, *how are you doing* (often spell as *How ya doing*), in medial ellipsis, auxiliary has been omitted in this greeting when speaker says *How ya doing*. For instance,

How < ---- > ya doing Ms.

It is clear from the example above that “are” has been omitted by speaker when asking something to the other speaker.

Medial auxiliary verb ellipsis often happens in Wh-questions, between the question word and the subject. For instance, what < ---- > she say.

Theory of Sinclair (ed.) (2000)

Sinclair ((ed.) 2000:399-400) states that ellipsis often occurs in conversations. He divides ellipsis in conversation in to three. They are ellipsis in question, ellipsis in replies and ellipsis in agreement.

Ellipsis in question is common with questions which show that you find what someone has said interesting or surprising or that you don't agree with them. These questions always have a pronoun as their subject.

Example: *'He gets free meals, does He?'*

He also says that ellipsis can often be used in questions when the context makes it clear what is meant. The question consists of just 'WH-word'

Example: *'But I'm afraid there's more. What?'*

Other questions can also consist of only a very few words when the context makes it clear what is meant. Short questions of these kinds are often used to express surprise or to offer something to someone.

Example: *'Cup of coffee? Lionel asked, kindly.'*

Ellipsis in replies often happen when reply to 'WH-questions, speaker can often use one word or a group of words rather than a full sentence. Speakers do this to avoid repeating words used in the question. For example, if someone asks *'What is your favourite colour?'*, the normal reply is a single word, for example 'Blue', rather than a sentence such as *'My favourite colour is blue'*

In replying the question, the speaker usually omits *yes* or *no* in *yes/no* question and just replay with a sentence adjunct or an adverb of degree. For instance, *do you think they're very important? ___ Maybe*

Ellipsis of agreement is often used when the speaker wants to show that he/she agrees with something that has just been said, or to say that it also applies to someone or something else. One way of doing this is by using 'too' after an auxiliary or form of 'be'. Example: *'I like baked beans.' Yes, I do too'*

Speaker can also use ellipsis when he/she wants to show that he/she agrees with something negative that has jus been said, or to say that it also applies to someone or something. One way of doing this is by using an auxiliary or form of 'be' followed by 'not' and 'either' Example: *'I don't know. I don't either.'*

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Approach of the Study

The writer uses qualitative approach to identify the problems that occur in the dialogue of Evelyn Anthony's *The Relic* and Louis L'amour's *The Lonesome Gods* because the writer will give description of the data that are found in those novels and the result of the study will be given into short essay form. Williams and Chesterman (in Isa 2006:39) state:

Roughly speaking, the goal of qualitative research is to describe the quality of something in some enlightening way. More strictly, qualitative research can lead to conclusions about what is possible, what can happen , or what can happen at least sometimes; it does not allow conclusions about what is probable, general, or universal.

Moreover, this study is also library research because the data that are used through novels, and not from the data that are got from the field. In other word, the writer uses American novels as the source of data about ellipsis and will not conduct the research with experimental study in the field.

Data Collecting Methods

The writer collects the data by searching in the novel especially in the dialogs. At the first, the writer chooses the novel entitled *The Relic* and *The Lonesome Gods* as the sources of data and tries to find the data which consists of ellipsis. After that, the writer reads the dialogs carefully and identifies the dialogs that are suspected as the data. After observing those data, the writer writes all of them into the data card. All of those data are classified based on the characteristic of ellipsis to make the writer easy in analyzing the data. In giving the explanation about ellipsis, the writer uses random sampling from the data that are found in the novel. There are many kinds of ellipsis in those novels, but the writer selects the data only in the dialogs of the novels and not in the narration although it is possible to analyze the use of elliptical sentence in the narration.

Data Corpus

There are 64 data which consist of 11 data of lexical ellipsis, 11 data of grammatical ellipsis, 4 data of agreement ellipsis, and 38 data of clausal ellipsis.

Method of Data Analysis

The result of this study and data analysis will be explained in to short essay form. It has the aim to make the explanation much clearer and easy to be understood. The writer also gives the short explanation about the theories, definitions and opinions from grammar or syntax and relates them in to data in the dialogs of the novels. The writer will explain the different kinds of ellipsis according to the contexts based on Halliday (1994), Biber *et al.* (1999), Sinclair (ed.) (2000), theories on ellipsis of dialogs from the novel that are going to be analyzed.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

The Kinds and Characteristics of Lexical Ellipsis

The use of ellipsis in dialogs of novels often happens especially in American novels. Ellipsis makes the sentence to be ungrammatical because many parts of sentence that have been omitted. Ellipsis which comes in lexical has the characteristics the omission of subject, predicate, object and adverb from the sentence. So, there are four kinds of ellipsis in lexical ellipsis. They are subjective ellipsis, predicative ellipsis, objective ellipsis and adjunctive ellipsis.

1. Subjective Ellipsis

In conversation, the speaker usually omits subject from the sentence because the speaker and hearer meet each other directly. This way often happens to minimize the conversation.

Elliptical of subject often happens in dialogs of American novels. There are some examples of subjective ellipsis, let see the example below,

Farley's father (A) and Farley (B) make small conversation,

(1) A: "Where's Jacob?"

B: "Ø ain't seen him in a while."(TLG 19)

From the dialog above, Farley's father asks Farley about Jacob in informal situation between a son and a father. In this small conversation, Farley's father wants to know where Jacob is and Farley answers that he has seen him in a while. When answering the question from his father, Farley omits subject in his conversation because both of them meet each other and can understand the utterance that is spoken by Farley. Isa (2006:53) also defines that the omission of subject in dialogs often happens because speaker and hearer meet directly. The speaker usually omits subject *I* in conversation because the speaker is clear.

The omission of subject in conversation has the function to minimize the conversation when the meaning can be understood without subtracting the meaning of utterance. Just like, Biber *et al.* (2000:1105) in which ellipsis of subject is explained.

The omission of subject in spoken language can be understood by other speaker because they speak directly, this condition will be very different when this conversation is used in written language. It will make the sentence to be ungrammatical and sometimes make the other people who read in written language be confuse.

The other example of subjective ellipsis with different subject can be seen from dialogs below,

Farley (A) speaks with his friend (B),

(2) A: "Wild stuff. I seen tracks a dozen times. Must be some of that bunch Ventura an' his crowd was chasin'. He said he ran'em into the dessert."

B: "Ø ain't more'n five or six head."(TLG 398)

In the conversation above, the subject that is omitted is *they* because this pronoun refers to (*more than five or six head*). In this context, the use of ain't as the contraction of (are not) makes clear that the subject that is omitted is *they*.

The omission of subject has the function to minimize the conversation because both of the speakers can understand the meaning and also the context.

The deletion of subjective in this conversation makes the sentence to be ungrammatical in written language because there is one part of important parts of sentence has been omitted. Furthermore, it will make the other people who read this novel who doesn't understand about elliptical of subject will confuse when the subject is omitted.

The other example of subjective ellipsis can be seen from dialogs below,

Farley (A) and Fletcher make small conversation,

(3) A: "When the wagon was moving again, I said to my father, "I saw an Indian."

B: "Fletcher was sitting up. "Ø Ain't likely. They tell me Injuns don't come to the well no more. Not at night, anyway."(LG 61)

In this conversation, Fletcher omits the subject but both of the speaker and also Farley's father understand the utterance that the omission of subject refers to (an Indian). The omission of subject has the aim to make the conversation shorter without subtracting the meaning and can be understood.

This condition will be different when this conversation is used in written language. It will make the sentence to be ungrammatical and sometimes makes the other people don't understand and dizzy about the meaning.

The other example of subjective ellipsis found in the novel is in dialog below,

Rad (A) and Farley (B),

(4) A: "You ain't nothin'."

B: "Ø Ask the men who tried to steal my horses out by Coldwater," (TLG296)

In the example (4) the speaker omits the subject (you). In this dialog, it is clear that speaker A (Rad) speaks to speaker B (Farley) in impolite statement. It is clear from the conversation that speaker A (Rad) thinks that speaker Farley is nothing and bullshit. And then speaker (B) Farley commands speaker A (Rad) to ask the men who tried to steal Farley's horses out by coldwater. In this dialog, speaker B (Farley) omits subject (You) because he asks the other person directly.

It is common in conversation when the speaker commands the other person by deleting subject. It has the aim to minimize the command when the meaning can be understood by the other speaker.

The deletion of subject in written language will make the sentence to be ungrammatical and sometimes makes the other people who read to be confused.

Another example of subjective ellipsis is shown in dialog below,
Mr. Finney (A) and Farley (B)

(5) A: "Can't \emptyset sleep?"

B: "I woke up, and it was so bright. I wanted to listen." (TLG 33)

From the example above, the speaker A (Mr. Finney) asks the speaker B (Farley) because he sees that Farley can't sleep. So, Mr. Finney asks Farley by deleting subject because he speaks directly with him. It means the subject that is omitted is (you) because the subject refers to the second person.

The use of subjective ellipsis in question often happens in dialogs because the subject is clear and also to minimize the conversation. Just like in Isa (2007:53), he finds that the omission of subject is clear. For example,

A: How's looney?

B: \emptyset Don't know. Worse than they bought.

In written language, it will make the sentence to be ungrammatical because the subject has been omitted after modal (can) when asking the other people.

2. Predicative Ellipsis

Predicate is an important part in the sentence. In conversation, it is often omitted by the speakers. Predicate can be *noun*, *adjective* and also *verb*. Let's see the example below based on the data found in those novels,

A (the waitress) and B (Irina)

(6) A: "Are you Mrs. Spigo? Sorry, I can't pronounce it"

B: "Yes, I am \emptyset ," Irina said quickly (TR 253)

From the dialog above, the speaker A (the waitress) asks the speaker B (Irina) whether she is Mrs. Spigo or not and she says that she is Mrs. Spigo. When answering the question from the waitress, Irina only says *yes I am* without adding Mrs. Spigo although a word after copula be *am* actually must be added by Mrs. Spigo to make the sentence to be complete. From the dialog above, Irina has omitted Mrs. Spigo which has the function as a predicate of noun because she wants to minimize the conversation by deleting the word that has been spoken by the waitress.

So, it can be concluded that noun can be as a predicate of the sentence which refers to the subject of the sentence.

The omission of predicate (Mrs. Spigo) in written language will make the other people who read confuse.

There is another example of the omission of predicate from the sentence which has different function from the example above,

A (Lucy) and B (Volkov)

(7) A: "Are you hungry?"

B: "No. Are You \emptyset ?"

A: "Yes. Stay there and I'll make something for us." (TR 79)

From the example above, speaker A (Lucy) asks speaker B (Volkov) whether he is hungry or not and Volkov says that he is not hungry. After answering the question, Volkov gives the response to Lucy by asking back to her whether she is hungry or not and Lucy says that she is hungry also and she will make something that can be eaten for them.

In the case above, it shows that Volkov asks back to Lucy by deleting the predicate of the sentence to avoid the same word that has been spoken by Lucy when asking him (*hungry*) which has the function as predicate of adjective.

It is clear that the use of omission of predicate will make the sentence to be incomplete.

So, it can be concluded that the complete of the sentence in asking question in complete sentence with predicate which has the function as adjective is *are you hungry?*

3. Objective Ellipsis

In conversation, ellipsis of object often happens when the speaker has said the word of object. Let's see the example of objective ellipsis found in the novel,

A (Viktor) and B (Volkov)

(8) A: "A drink?" Victor inquired. "What would you like? We have excellent Russian Champaign or vodka."

B: "I don't drink \emptyset ." (TR 287)

From the conversation above that speaker A (Viktor) offers something to speaker B (Volkov) but speaker B refuses the offering from Viktor by saying (I don't drink). It is clear that Viktor offers excellent Russian Champaign or vodka to him and he says that he doesn't drink those things. It means that the object that is omitted refers to (Russian Champaign or vodka).

In conversation, ellipsis of object is common when the meaning can be understood by each other and also to minimize conversation. The characteristic of the sentence which has object in the sentence is the sentence can be changed to be passive form from active form. From the example above, the active form of the sentence which has object is (I don't drink Russian Champaign and vodka),

Auxiliary that is used in the sentence above is "do" and it indicates that the sentence uses present form of verbal sentence. This sentence can be changed to be passive form because it has object.

The active form above can be changed to be passive to be "The Russian Champaign or vodka is not drunk by me".

The use of objective ellipsis in written language will make the sentence to be incomplete and sometimes makes the other people confuse. Usually, the ellipsis of object comes after predicate and it has the characteristic that the sentence which has object can be made to be passive form.

Another example of objective ellipsis found in the novel can be seen in dialog below, A (Lepkin) and B (Adolph).

(9) A: "You understand me?"

B: "I understand \emptyset " (TR 130)

Based on the example (9), speaker A (Lepkin) asks to speaker B (Adolph) whether he understands him or not and Adolph answers the question that he understands him. From the context above, it is clear that Adolph just says (I understand) and omits the object (you).

In conversation above, both of the speakers meet with each other and it means that although Lepkin omits the object, both of the speakers can understand the meaning. The omission of object in this conversation to make the sentence to be short and the object in this sentence is very clear and doesn't need to be spoken again.

In the example above, the object of the sentence that is omitted is (you) and the complete sentence to be (I understand you). In this complete sentence, it is clear that it uses present form. The complete sentence of passive form is *you are understood by me*. This condition is very different when the conversation above is used in written language, it makes the sentence to be incomplete because there is a part of sentence which is omitted.

4. Adjunctive Ellipsis

Ellipsis of adjunct is also common in dialogs especially in American novel. It has the aim to avoid the repeating of word from the speaker when the meaning can be understood. Let see the example of adverbial ellipsis found in the novel,

A (Volkov) and B (Lucy)

(10) A: "Now will you away?"

B: "No, Lucy said. 'I won't \emptyset '" (TR 45)

From the example (10) speaker A (Volkov) asks speaker B (Lucy) whether he will go away or not and Lucy answers the question from Volkov by saying *I won't*. It is clear that Lucy omits the same word from Volkov to avoid the repeating question. The word that is omitted from the sentence is (*away*) as adverb of place. Adverb in this sentence comes after modal (*won't*) as the contraction from will not.

The adverbial ellipsis in written language will make the sentence to be incomplete and unclear. From the example above, it is clear that the position of the adverb is after modal auxiliary (*won't*). So, the complete of the sentence above with adjunctive ellipsis is *I won't away*.

The other example of adverbial ellipsis found in this novel is in dialog below,

A (Lucy) and B (Adolph)

(11) A: "When did you see him again?"

B: "I never saw him \emptyset ." (TR 94)

In the example (11), speaker A (Lucy) asks speaker B (Adolph) if he sees him again or not and he answers the question that he doesn't meet him again. In this conversation, it is clear that he has omitted the adverbial of time (again) to avoid the repeating of question from speaker A while the meaning can be understood by each other. The adverbial of ellipsis in this conversation lies after object (him).

In written language, the speaker often omits adverb from the sentence after object and it will make the sentence to be incomplete and unclear.

Characteristics of Grammatical Ellipsis

Ellipsis in conversation also happens in grammar of the sentence in which the auxiliary, copula *be* and perfective are omitted. So, in grammatical ellipsis there are three types of ellipsis which have different characteristics. They are auxiliary *do* ellipsis, copula *be* ellipsis and perfective ellipsis.

1. Auxiliary *do* Ellipsis

Auxiliary is also called as helping verb that add structural meaning or semantic coloring to verb carrying the full burden of lexical meaning, Frank (1972: 94). In question, auxiliary must be performed in forming the question. In conversation, people often omit the auxiliary in front of the main verb or in negation when the meaning can be understood. Let see the example below to understand the use of auxiliary ellipsis in question,

A (Remus) and B (Irina)

(12) A: Remus said, "He's gone a long time, Matiushka. \emptyset You want me to look for him?"

B: "No" Irina said (TR 267)

In the example (12), the speaker A (Remus) offers a helping to speaker B (Irina) by saying *you want me to look for him?* And Irina answers that she doesn't want to be helped. When offering a helping, Remus says without auxiliary in front of the subject because both of the speakers meet directly and it means that although Remus omits the auxiliary, Irina can understand the meaning.

According to Isa (2006: 49), he states that the omission of auxiliary *do* in front of subject *you* is often omitted in informal conversation.

Based on the case above, the subject is (*You*) and the auxiliary must be *do* because it indicates the use of present times. It is clear that the formula of forming an interrogative of verbal sentence in simple present,

It is clear that the auxiliary that is omitted is in front of the subject and after subject is verb 1 (want). The omission of auxiliary in conversation has the aim to make the conversation shorter without subtracting the meaning while both of the speakers understand the question.

In written language, the omission of auxiliary will make the sentence to be ungrammatical because auxiliary must be occurred in interrogative sentence. So, to make he sentence to be grammatical, it must be added by auxiliary *do* in front of subject. The interrogative to be like this, *do you want me to look for him?*

Another example of auxiliary ellipsis is in dialog below,

A (Irina) and B (Remus)

(13) A: “ \emptyset you know what to do’ Remus?”

B: “I know” He said (TR 262)

From the example above, speaker A (Irina) asks Remus about something that he will do and he answers that he knows something that he will do. When answering the question, Irina omits auxiliary in front of subject because she wants to make the interrogative shorter while Remus can understand the question.

In the case above, it is clear that auxiliary that is omitted is *do* because it happens in simple present times and the subject is *you*. The verb that is used is verb I (*know*).

In conversation, the ellipsis of auxiliary often happens and it will make the sentence to be ungrammatical in written language if the conversation is used in written language like in novel. To make the sentence to be grammatical, it must be added by auxiliary *do* in front of the subject.

The other example of auxiliary ellipsis can be seen in dialog below,

A (Professor Volkov) and B (Lucy)

(14) A: “ \emptyset you live by the sea?”

B: “I live on an island.”(TR 49)

In the example (14), speaker A (Professor Volkov) asks the question to speaker B (Lucy) whether he lives by the sea or not by omitting the auxiliary in front of the subject. Although Professor Volkov omits the auxiliary, Lucy can understand the question and answer the question based on the question from him.

In the case number (14), auxiliary that is omitted is *do* because the subject is *you*. It is clear from the conversation that the verb that is used is *verb* I (*understand*) and this conversation happens in present times.

The interrogative above will be ungrammatical in written language because in interrogative must be added by auxiliary in forming the question in front of the subject. To make the sentence to be grammatical, it must be added by auxiliary *do* in front of subject to be *do you live by the sea?*

Another example in can be seen in dialog below,

A (Lepkin) and B (Adolph).

(15) A: “ \emptyset you understand me?”

B: “I understand” (TR 130)

Speaker A (Lepkin) asks speaker B (Adolph) whether he understands him or not and he says that he understands him. In conversation above, it happens in present times and both of the speakers speak directly. Lepkin omits the auxiliary in front of subject in interrogative to make the conversation shorter but can be understood by speaker B.

In the case above, speaker A omits auxiliary in front of subject. Because subject is *you*, auxiliary that is used must be *do*.

The use of auxiliary ellipsis in question in spoken language is permitted because both of the speakers can understand the meaning, while in written language, it should be added by auxiliary to make the sentence to be grammatical in written language. The sentence to be *do you understand me?*

2. Copula *be* Ellipsis

In conversation people usually omit copula in front of subject in interrogative but both of the speaker can understand each other. Labov (in Isa 2006:47) states that the omission of copula *be* often happens in informal conversation.

Let see the example below,

A (Madame) and B (Lucy)

(16) A: “∅ You on holyday, M’selle?”

B: “Working holyday.”(TR 41)

In the example (16), speaker A (Madame) omits copula *be* in front of the subject when asking the question to speaker B (Lucy). Copula *be* that is omitted is (are) because the subject of the sentence is *you* as pronoun and the word after subject is adverb. It is known that in forming an interrogative of the nominal sentence in simple present must be added by copula *be* in front of subject to make the sentence to be grammatical.

Subject (I) must be followed by copula *be* am, subject (you, we, they) must be followed by copula *be* (are) and subject (she, he, and it) must be followed by copula *be* (is).

It is shown in the example above that the use of ellipsis of copula *be* “is” to make the conversation shorter without subtracting the meaning and both of the speakers understand the meaning. Just like, Biber *et al.* (2000:1105), he states that ellipsis of copula *be* occurs in yes-no interrogative.

In written language, it will be ungrammatical because interrogative can’t be formed without copula *be*. So, to make the sentence to be grammatical in written language, it must be added with copula *be* in front of subject to be *are you on holyday, M’selle?*

The example below has the same subject as the previous example but it has different pattern and it must be added by copula *be* (are) to make the sentence to be grammatical in written language.

A (Farley’s father) and B (Kelso)

(17) A: “∅ You all right?”

B: “Yes, yes, thank you. A little unsteady, is all. Will we be here long?”

(TLG 59)

From the example above, speaker A (Farley’s father) asks the question to speaker B (Kelso) whether he is right or not and Kelso answers that he is fine. It is common to omit copula *be* in front of subject when the speaker meets each other to make the relation ship closer and casual.

So, to make the interrogative above grammatical, it must be changed to be *are you all right?*

Another example can be seen in dialog below,

A (The waitress) and B (Irina)

(18) A: “∅ everything all right?”

B: “Yes, thank you. I’ll have the crayfish. And a bottle of moselle”. (TR 253)

In the example (18), the sentence is ungrammatical in written language because in forming the interrogative must be added by copula *be* in front of the subject. It is clear that the subject of the sentence is (*everything*) as a *noun* and after subject is *adverb*. It must be added by copula *be* because noun can’t be stand alone.

It is shown that the subject is *noun* (everything) as a singular form and the right copula *be* that must be added in front of subject is “is”. So, to make the sentence to be grammatical, the question must be changed to be *is everything all right?*

Let see the other example of copula ellipsis,

A (Farley) and B (Verne)

(19) A: “How’re you’doin’, Verne? ∅ you bein’ sick an’ all, and then losin’ blood.”

B: “I’ll be all right. I’ll make it.”(TLG 34)

In the example (19), speaker A (Farley) asks about the condition of speaker B (Verne) whether she is sick or not and she answers that she is all right. It is clear from the question

that this moment happens in progressive time because the verb that is used is V-ing form in present time. In forming interrogative sentence in progressive must be added by copula *be* in front of subject. Copula *be* that must be added is *are* because the subject is *you*.

Another example of copula ellipsis is in dialog below,

A (Monte) and B (Farley)

(20) A: “∅ You going to ride that stallion?” Monte asked

B: “Sooner or later,” (TLG 243)

In the example above, the tense that is used is the future time. It is shown from the verb (going to). The question above will be ungrammatical in written language because there is no *copula be* in front of the subject. It often happens in informal situation. The speaker A (Monte) wants to ask speaker B (Farley) whether he will ride that stallion or not and he answers that sooner or later he will ride.

It is clear that in forming interrogative in future time should use *copula be* in front of subject if use (be going to). So, to make the sentence to be grammatical, it must be changed to be *are you going to ride that stallion?*

3. Perfective Ellipsis

Ellipsis in perfective tense often happens in conversation when the meaning can be understood and the speaker meets directly with other speaker. It happens when the speaker speaks about the perfectives activities or something that has been done in perfect time. The indication of perfective is *have/has + verb 3*. Isa (2006:50) states that the omission of *have* in formal language is not grammatical. Let see the example below,

A (Farley’s mother) and B (Farley)

(21) A: “∅ You Changed?”

B: “I fell in love, ma’am.” (TLG: 25)

In the example above, it is clear that the speaker has omitted *have* in front of subject because verb that is used after subject is *verb 3 (changed)* and it indicates that the sentence happens in perfective times.

Auxiliary *have* must be followed by subject (*I, You, We, and they*) and Auxiliary *has* must be followed by subject (*She, He, and It*).

From the dialog above, speaker A (Farley’s mother) asks her son whether he has changed his mind or not and he says that he has fallen in love with her. It is shown that the subject is *you* and it means that the auxiliary of perfective that must be used is *have* to make the sentence to be grammatical.

When omitting *have*, both of the speakers understand because they speak directly and meet each other, the omission of perfective has the function to minimize the conversation.

The omission of perfective in written language will make the interrogative to be ungrammatical especially in formal language. This way often happens in informal situation.

Another example of perfective ellipsis found in the novel can be seen in dialog below, let see the example below,

A (Jacob) and B (Finney)

(22) A: “Have you seen Mr. Fletcher?”

B: “He’s around. ∅ You seen him?” (TLG 180)

In the example above, speaker A (Jacob) asks about Mr. Fletcher and speaker B (Finney) answers that he is around. After that speaker B (Finney) asks again to speaker A (Jacob) whether he has ever seen him or not by omitting perfective auxiliary. In the example above, the use of perfective ellipsis in order to avoid the same word from the first question and also to minimize the conversation whether the meaning can be understood by each other.

In formal language or written language, this way will make the sentence to be ungrammatical because the auxiliary of perfective doesn’t appear. To make the sentence to be grammatical, it must be added by (have) in front of subject to be *have you seen him?*

Kinds and Characteristics of Agreement Ellipsis

Ellipsis of agreement often happens when the speaker says the same idea or support the other speaker. There are two kinds of ellipsis in agreement ellipsis which has different characteristics. They are positive agreement ellipsis and negative agreement ellipsis.

1. Positive Agreement Ellipsis

In giving the same idea, the speaker prefers avoid the repeating of the same words to repeat again. It often happens in dialogs of American novels. Let see the example below,

A (Farley) and B (Jacob) tell about the woman

(23) A: "I like her."

B: "So do I \emptyset ," (TLG 154)

In the example above, speaker A (Farley) says that he likes the woman to speaker B (Jacob) and Jacob has the same idea with Farley that he likes her also. In saying that he agrees with Farley's statement, Jacob just says *so do I* in showing the positive agreement.

In this case, there are some parts of sentence that are omitted. They are (*like her also*).

Just like the definition that is given by Sinclair (ed.) (2000:400) about ellipsis that is often spoken by speaker in showing positive agreement.

The other example of positive agreement can be seen in dialog below,

A (Jacob) and B (Finney)

(24) A: "He was special. So is the boy \emptyset ."

B: "Is he here?" (TLG 181)

In example (24), speaker A (Jacob) says to speaker B (Finney) that (he) was a special and he also says that the boy is also special by omitting the same words by changing the words special to be so is the boy. In the case above, Jacob uses *so* in showing the positive agreement.

It is very clear in forming the agreement in conversation will make the sentence to be incomplete in written language because there are some parts of the sentence have been omitted.

2. Negative Agreement Ellipsis

In showing the same idea in negative can be used negative agreement. Let see the example below,

Jacob (A) and Finney (B)

(25) A: "Have you seen Mr. Fletcher?"

B: "He's around. You seen him?"

A: "He came by the bookstore. I don't like him."

B: "Neither do I \emptyset ." (TLG 180)

In the example above, speaker A (Jacob) says to speaker B (Finney) that he dislikes Mr. Fletcher and he says that he doesn't like him also to Jacob when he says like that, speaker B (Finney) also supports his idea that she doesn't like him also by saying Neither do I. Speaker B has omitted some of words from the sentence (don't like him).

It is clear that in forming negative agreement can be formed by using neither plus auxiliary without not and than subject. The use of negative agreement in written language will make the sentence to be incomplete and unclear if the readers don't understand the way in omitting negative agreement ellipsis.

Just like Sinclair (ed.) (2000:400), he states that ellipsis can be used when the speaker wants to show that the speaker agrees with something that has just been said, or to say that it also applies to someone or something else.

The use of ellipsis of agreement is to avoid the same words when the meaning can be understood by each other.

There is another example of negative ellipsis with different pattern,

A (Jacob) and B (Farley)

- (26) A: "I didn't put no stock in such things," he said.
B: "I didn't either \emptyset ." (TLG 237)

From the example (26), it is shown that speaker A says that he doesn't put no stock in such things and the speaker B also doesn't put no stock in there. In negative statement, speaker B speaks I didn't either to show that he also doesn't put on there.

The following pattern will describe the pattern of negative agreement ellipsis from the dialog above,

It is clear from both of the patterns in the example number (25) and (26). In example (26), speaker B speaks by saying either with not after auxiliary. It means that in forming negative ellipsis, it can use neither or either. When the speaker uses *neither* in forming negative agreement, speaker shouldn't add *not*. While the speaker uses *either* in negative agreement, the speaker should add *not* after *auxiliary*.

The use of negative agreement ellipsis in conversation is to avoid the same of words and also to minimize the conversation. In written language, the use of agreement is permitted to avoid the repeating but will make the sentence to be incomplete.

The Kinds and Characteristics of Clausal Ellipsis

Speaker usually omits some of the words in the clause in conversation to minimize the conversation and to avoid the repeating of the same words that have been spoken in questions or statement. There are some kinds of clausal ellipsis which have different characteristics.

1. Auxiliary *do* + Subject Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits subject and auxiliary in the sentence when speaking to the other speaker in informal situation, let see the example below,

- A (Lucy) and b (Professor Volkov)
(27) A: "Why \emptyset not \emptyset take some coffee? It's better for you."
B: "How do you know?" (TR 44)

From the example above, Lucy offers professor Volkov to take some coffee because she knows that coffee is better for him and Professor Volkov answers the offering from Lucy by asking how Lucy knows whether coffee is good. In asking question, Lucy has omitted subject (*you*) and auxiliary (*do*) because she meets directly with Volkov. The omission of subject and auxiliary *do* often happens in conversation in informal situation because both of the speakers understand the meaning.

Just like Biber *et al.* (1999: 1104) in which the omission of subject and operator have been discussed.

In the case above, the sentence to be ungrammatical because the omission of auxiliary and subject. The subject that is omitted in the sentence above is (*you*) because Lucy speaks directly with Volkov. The auxiliary that is used must be (*do*) because the subject is (*you*). The interrogative sentence above should be *why don't you take some coffee?*

Another example of the ellipsis of subject and auxiliary can be seen in dialog below,
A (Rakovsky) and B (Lepkin)

- (28) A: "You asked about the family?" Rakovsky said. "That's way I've come"
B: "But why \emptyset come here?" Lepkin frowned. (TR 8)

It is clear from the example above that Rakovsky says to Lepkin whether he wants to know about the family and Lepkin asks back him why Rakovsky comes to this place. In this conversation, when Lepkin asks to Rakovsky, he omits *subject* and *auxiliary* from the interrogative sentence. It has the aim to minimize the conversation because both of them understood the meaning.

The omission of *auxiliary* and the *subject* in interrogative sentence will make the sentence to be incomplete and ungrammatical. The subject that is omitted in the sentence above is *you* because Lepkin speaks directly to Rakovsky.

The complete of the interrogative sentence based on the pattern above to be *why do you come here?*

2. Subject + Copula *be* Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits subject and copula *be* in informal situation. Let see the example below,

A (Lucy) and B (Yuri)

(29) A: "what is it?"

B: "∅ a great treasure." (TR 30)

From the example above, Lucy asks something to Yuri by saying *what is it?* And Yuri answers the question by omitting the same words that are spoken by Lucy. Yuri just says *a great treasure* by omitting *it* as the subject and *is* as the *copula be* of the subject *a great treasure*.

The omission of *subject* and *copula be* will make the sentence to be incomplete and unclear in written language. From the example above, it shows that *a great treasure* has a function as *a noun* which has the position as *predicate*. So, to make the sentence to be complete, it must be replaced to be *it is a great treasure*.

The example below has the same pattern with the pattern above,

A (Viktor) and B (Irina)

(30) A: "Who is this man?"

B: "∅ The only survivor of 'Spartacus.'" (TR 225)

It is clear that when Viktor asks the question to Irina about this man, Irina just says the only survivor of Spartacus by omitting the same words that have been spoken in questions.

To make the answer to be grammatical and complete, it can be replaced to be *this man is the only survivor of Spartacus*.

Another example of subject and copula *be* with the same pattern can be seen in dialog below,

A (Lucy) and B (Remus)

(31) A: "Are you happy here, Remus?"

B: "∅ Very happy". (TR 230)

From the example above, Lucy asks Remus whether he is happy or not. When answering the question, Remus just says *very happy* without repeating the same words that have been spoken by Lucy to minimize the conversation and the meaning can be understood.

To make the sentence to be complete, it must be added by *I* as the subject because Lucy and Remus speak directly and the pronoun in here should be *I*. In simple present time, subject *I* must be followed by copula *be* (am). So, to make the sentence complete, it must be changed to be *I am very happy*.

Another example of subject and copula ellipsis found in those novels is in dialog below,

A (Volkov) and B (Lucy)

(32) A: "What's the time? I forgot to put on my watch this morning."

B: "∅ Nearly twelve". (TR 50)

From the conversation above, Volkov asks Lucy about the time because he forgets to put on the watch this morning. In answering the question, Lucy says *nearly twelve* by omitting the same words that have been spoken by Volkov. When deleting those parts, Lucy or Volkov understand the meaning because they meet directly.

It is clear that the subject that is omitted is *the time* and the copula *be is*. So, to make the sentence complete, it must be changed to be *the time is nearly twelve*.

3. Subject + Predicate Ellipsis

In whole clause ellipsis, sometimes the speaker omits subject and predicate as the following examples,

A (Volkov) and B (Lucy)

(33) A: "What sort of book do you like?"

B: "∅ Books on religion." (TR 56)

In conversation above, Volkov wants to know about what sort of book Lucy likes and Lucy says that she likes books on religion. When answering the question, Lucy just answers in short statement by saying *books on religion* by omitting the same words that have been spoken by Volkov to avoid the repeating question and also to minimize the conversation.

In this case, Lucy omits subject and predicate. Subject in this clause is *I* because it refers to the first person, and the predicate that has been omitted is *like*.

In written language, the omission of those parts will make the sentence ungrammatical and incomplete. To make the sentence complete it must be added by *I* and *Like* to be *I like books on religion*.

Just like Sinclair (ed.) (2000:399), he states that when replying the Wh- question from speaker, you can omit the same words that have been said in question.

Halliday (1994:320) states that in answering WH- question the entire clause is often omitted except the response to the WH-element.

4. Predicate + Object Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits predicate and object from the sentence when the meaning can be understood. Let see the example below,

A (Lucy's father) and B (Lucy)

(34) A: "I won't live to do it, so you must take my place."

B: "How can I ∅?" She whispered (TR34)

In conversation above, Lucy's father says that he doesn't want live to do that and he asks Lucy to take his place. When answering the question from her father, she asks the way to take her father place by omitting predicate and object of the sentence. The omission of predicate and object in this sentence is to avoid the repeating of the same words that has been spoken by Lucy's father.

In written language, the sentence will be incomplete. So, it must be added by *take your place*.

Another example of predicate and object ellipsis is in dialog below,

A (Lepkin) and B (Rakovsky)

(35) A: He said, "I can save Natalia and the boys."

B: "and you will?" Rakovsky asked.

A: "I will ∅. I promise you." (TR7)

In conversation above, Lepkin says to Rakovsky that he can save Natalia and the boys and Rakovsky asks to Lepkin whether he will save them or not. When answering the question from Rakovsky, Lepkin says that he promises him to save them by omitting predicate and object because those parts have been spoken at the first.

In written language, it will make the conversation to be incomplete and unclear. So, to make it grammatical, it must be added by *save Natalia and the boys*. So, the complete of interrogative above is *how can I save Natalia and boys*.

5. Predicate + Adverb Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits predicate and adverb also because both of the speakers meet directly and they understood the meaning. Let see the example below,

A (Volkov) and B (Lucy)

(36) A: "You're always hungry. You wanted breakfast the first time we met,"

B: "I didn't \emptyset ." (TR 79)

In conversation above, Volkov asks Lucy whether she always hungry and he offers her to take breakfast at the first time they meet. In answering the question, Lucy just says that *she didn't*. It is clear from the question that Volkov asks her to take breakfast at the first time they meet. So, it can be concluded that Lucy has omitted some words from Volkov because both of them understood.

In written language, the omission will make the sentence to be incomplete and unclear. So, to make it complete, it must be added by *want breakfast* as predicate and the first time we met as adverb. So, the complete of the sentence above is *I didn't want breakfast the first time we met*.

6. Perfective + Copula *be* Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits perfective and copula *be* in informal situation, let see the example below,

A (Mr. de Grot) and B (Volkov)

(37) A: " \emptyset You a good sailor?"

B: "No. I've never been I a boat." (TR 254)

In the example above, both of the speakers meet each other directly and speaker A (Mr. de Grot) asks to speaker B (Volkov) whether he has been a good sailor or not and Volkov answers that he has never in a boat and it means that he never been a good sailor. In asking the question, speaker A (Mr. de Grot) just says (you a good sailor), it is clear from Volkov when answering the question that he uses perfective times and it means that the Mr. de Grot also uses perfective tense.

When omitting perfective and copula *be*, both of the speakers understand the meaning because both of the speakers speak directly. It will be different if it is used in written language because it makes the sentence to be incomplete and sometimes make the other people confuse.

So, to make the sentence to be complete in interrogative, the sentence must be added by *have and copula be (been)* because it uses perfective tense. The complete sentence is *have you been a good sailor?*

7. WH Questions + Copula *be* Ellipsis

In the dialogues, especially in the novel, people usually speak in short statement with ungrammatical sentences. In spoken language, it can be used and accepted because both of the speakers understand about it. While in written language, it makes the sentence ungrammatical and the readers will confuse about it. Let see the example below,

A (Lucy) and B (Lepkin)

(38) A: " \emptyset The box?" she sat up, bare breasted with her hair hanging down.

B: "The thin box" (TR 25)

In the example above, the sentence is not grammatical because it doesn't have *WH question* and *copula be*. In spoken language, if the speaker wants to ask somebody in the short question is possible because both of the speakers can understand the question, but in written language, it can be wrong because the structure is ungrammatical. The speaker A (Lucy) wants to ask something to speaker B (Lepkin) in short question. The problem in this sentence is it doesn't have WH question and also copula *be* to make the sentence complete or grammatical. The WH question that is used must be "*which*" because the speaker (A) wants to choose the kind of box that she needs. After "*which*", it must be followed by *copula be*. In

this sentence, copula *be* that is used is “is” because the sentence refers to subject which has the function as a noun.

So, to make the sentence to be grammatical in written language, the sentence must be added by *which* and *is* to be *which the box is?*

8. Subject + Copula *be* + Predicate Ellipsis

In conversation, usually speaker omits subject, copula *be* and predicate in conversation. Let see the example below,

A (Volkov) and B (Lucy)

(39) A: “Where are we going?”

B: “ \emptyset to my apartment.” (TR 74)

When Volkov answers Lucy where they are going to, she just answers “to my apartment” by omitting some parts of the clause. In conversation, it often happens to avoid the repeating question from other speaker.

In the case above, the parts that have been omitted are *we* as the predicate, *are* as copula *be* from the subject *we* and *going* as the predicate which indicates the progressive time. So, to make it complete, it must be changed to be *we are going to my apartment*.

Just like Sinclair (ed.) (2000:399), he states that when replying the question, speaker often omits one word or a group of words rather than a full sentence.

In written language, the omission of those parts will make the sentence to be incomplete and unclear.

9. Subject + Modal + Predicate Ellipsis

People usually speak by deleting a word or some of words from the sentence in yes-no question. It happens in conversation because they meet directly with the other speaker and both of them understand about the utterance. It is known that in yes-no question, the speaker can answer the question by saying *yes* or *no*. in order to support this statement, Azar (1992:128) states that yes no question is a question that maybe answered by *yes* or *no*. It also has the aim to avoid the repeating of the question. Let see the dialog below,

A (Viktor) and B (Natalia)

(40) A: “Can I see? He asked

B: “No! \emptyset She sounded angry. (TR 20-21)

From the conversation above, Viktor asks Natalia whether he wants to see the red thing in her bedroom and she doesn’t want Viktor sees that. When saying the answer, she just says no by omitting the whole of the clause from the question. From the example above, the whole of the clause has been omitted by Natalia when answering the question from Viktor. The whole clause that is omitted [*You can not see*]. *You* as the *subject*, *can* as *modal* and *see* as *predicate* of the sentence. Just like Halliday (1994:318), he states that in yes/no question of the whole clause, the answer may involve ellipsis of the whole clause.

So, to make it complete, it must be changed to be, *No, you can’t see*. The effect of ellipsis when replying the question in written language is clear. When the speaker just answers no, it will make the other people who don’t understand the short statement will confuse and don’t understand the utterance especially in novel.

10. Auxiliary *do* + Subject + Predicate Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits auxiliary, subject and predicate from the sentence when asking something. Let see the example below,

A (Gregor Ivanovitch) and B (Rakovsky)

(41) A: “Sit down, my friend,” he suggested.

B: “ \emptyset a cigarette?” Rakovsky took one, lit in and Lepkin noticed how his hand shook. (TR 3)

In example above, Gregor and Rakovsky meet each other after long time both of them didn't see. When Gregor asks rakovsky to sit down, Rakovsky offers him a cigarette by deleting auxiliary, subject, and predicate.

The parts that have been omitted are *do* as *auxiliary*, *you* as *subject* because both of them meet directly and *want* as *predicate*. So, to make the sentence complete, it must be changed to be *do you want a cigarette?*

Sinclair (ed.) (2000: 399) states that ellipsis can be used when the speaker wants to offer something to someone in short statement.

Isa (2006: 53) also states that the speaker usually omits the previous parts of the interrogative sentence when the meaning can be understood by both of the speakers.

In written language, the omission if auxiliary, subject and predicate will make the sentence to be incomplete and unclear.

11. Subject + Predicate + Object Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits the whole clause which consists of subject, predicate, and object. Let see the examples below,

A (Natalia) and B (Lepkin)

(42) A: "You shot him, didn't you?"

B: He said simply, "Yes \emptyset . It was all I could do for him." (TR13)

In conversation above, Natalia asks Lepkin whether he shots the boy or not and he says that he shots him by saying *no* in short answer when the meaning can be understood. In the case above, the parts of the whole clause that have been omitted are *I* as the *subject*, *shot* as the *predicate* from the *Verb II* and *him* as the *object*.

In making the complete answer from the context above, it must be changed to be *yes, I shot him*.

12. Subject + Perfective + Negation + Predicate + Object Ellipsis

In conversation, the speaker usually omits subject, perfective, predicate and object to make the conversation shorter, let see the dialog below,

A (Eloise Bruckner) and B (Peter Muller)

(43) A: "Have you seen the paper?"

B: "No, \emptyset " (TR 192)

In the case above, the omission of the whole clause consists of subject, perfective, negation, predicate and object. The predicate in this example is the verb from perfective tense. In the conversation above, Eloise asks Peter whether he has seen the paper or not and he says that he hasn't seen the paper by saying the short statement "no".

To make the sentence to be complete, it must be changed to be *no, I haven't seen the paper*.

The omission of those parts from the sentence will make the sentence to be incomplete and sometimes make the reader confuse in written language.

13. Subject + Predicate + Negation + Object Ellipsis

In conversation, in informal situation, speaker usually omits subject, negation, predicate and object from the sentence. Let see the example below,

A (The man) and B (Volkov)

(44) A: "Have you notified the coast guard?"

B: "No \emptyset . What is the coast guard? Where do I find it?" (246)

In conversation above, Volkov asks the man something because he has lost his friend in the coast and the man asks him whether he has notified to the coast guard or not and he says not. When answering the question, Volkov omits some of the words that have been spoken by the man to minimize the conversation.

To make the sentence complete, it must be changed to be *no, I haven't notified the coast guard*. I as subject, have notified as predicate, not as negation and the coast guard as the object.

In written language, those omissions will make the sentence incomplete and unclear.

14. Subject + Perfective + Predicate + Adverb Ellipsis

Subject, perfective, predicate and adverb are usually omitted by speaker in conversation. Let see the example below,

A (Lucy) and B (Volkov)

(45) A: "What have you got there?" She asked

B: "∅ Chocolate ∅," Volkov answered. (TR 107)

In conversation above, Lucy asks Volkov about something that he has got in the place that has been visited by Volkov and he just says that he has got chocolate. In answering the question, Volkov has omitted the whole of the clause which consist of *I* as the *subject*, *have* as *perfective*, *got* as *predicate* and *there* as *adverb*. He omits those parts because he meets directly with Lucy and it happens in informal situation.

To make the sentence complete, it must be changed to be *I have got chocolate there*.

In written language, it will give effect to the sentence. The sentence that is omitted will be unclear.

15. Subject + Copula *be* + Adverb Ellipsis

Subject, copula *be* and *adverb* are usually omitted in spoken language. Let see the example below,

A (Volkov) and B (Lucy)

(46) A: "Are you alone?"

B: "yes ∅" (TR154)

In conversation above, Volkov asks Lucy whether she is alone or not and she says that she is alone. When answering the question, Lucy just says *yes* to avoid the repeating words that have been spoken by Volkov.

In written language, it will make the sentence to be incomplete because there are many words from the sentence that have been omitted. In spoken language, the omission of those parts can be understood because they meet directly.

So, to make the sentence to be grammatical and complete, it must be added by *I am alone*. From the case above, it is clear that *I* which has the function as subject, *am* as copula *be* from *I* and *alone* as adverb has been omitted. The complete sentence that must be spoken by Lucy is *Yes, I am alone*.

Another example of subject, copula *be* and adverb ellipsis can be seen in dialog below,

A (The waitress) and B (Irina)

(47) A: "Everything all right?"

B: "Yes ∅, thank you. I'll have the crayfish. And a bottle of moselle". (253)

In conversation above, the waitress asks Irina whether everything all right or not and Irina answers that everything is all right by omitting parts of the clause that has been spoken by the waitress to avoid the repeating of words that have been spoken by the waitress.

In written language, it will make the sentence to be ungrammatical and unclear. It is clear that parts of the clause that have been omitted are, *everything* as a subject, *is* as copula *be* of everything because *everything* is singular, and *all right* as adverb. The omission of those parts has the same pattern as the pattern above. So, to make it complete, it must be replaced by *Yes, Everything is all right*.

16. Predicate + Preposition + Object Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits the words that have been spoken in question, let see the example below,

A (Gusev) and B (Irina)

(48) A: "How would you cope with two of them?"

B: "I wouldn't \emptyset ," Irina said. (TR 225)

In conversation above, Gusev asks Irina would she cope with two of them and she says that she wouldn't by saying I wouldn't. Irina just answers in short answer to avoid the repeating words that have been spoken by Gusev in the question. The parts of the clause that have been omitted are *cope with two of them*. *Cope* has the function as *predicate*, *with* as *preposition* and *two of them* as *object* which consist of *two* that has the function as *quantity*, *of* as *preposition* and *them* as the *pronoun*.

In written language, the omission of those parts will make the sentence to be incomplete. So, it must be completed to be *I wouldn't cope with two of them*.

17. Subject + Auxiliary + Predicate + Preposition Ellipsis

In conversation, subject, copula *be* and predicate is also often omitted in conversation.

Let see the example below,

A (Lucy) and B (Adolph)

(49) A: "What are you talking about?"

B: " \emptyset The Holy cross of Saint Vladimir. Priceless. Thirteenth-century gold and jewels. It was the same. It was the cross Boris stole. And he'd taken it. Without knowing what he'd got? I could have wept thinking what I'd missed. I made inquires. I tried to find it. I'd have paid anything." (TR 95)

In conversation above, Lucy asks Adolph about something that he is talking and he just answers the main point without repeating the same words that have been spoken by Lucy.

In the case above, the parts that have been omitted are *I* as the first *subject*, *am* as *auxiliary of the subject I*, *talking* as the *predicate of progressive time (Verb – ing)* and *about* as the *preposition*. So, to make the sentence complete, it must be added in front of the main point of the conversation that is spoken by Adolph to be *I am talking about*.

It is clear that the omission of those parts will make the sentence to be unclear in written language or in formal situation.

18. Subject + Perfective + Predicate + Adverb Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits subject, predicate and adverb when speaking to the other people. Let see the example below,

A (Fletcher) and B (Farley)

(50) A: "you've been over this trail?"

B: " \emptyset five times" (TLG 2)

In conversation above, Fletcher asks Farley whether he has been over this trail or not and he says he has been over this trail five times in short statement because it happens in informal situation. He just says five times when answering the question from Fletcher.

From the case above, it is clear that Farley answers the question in short statement by omitting the whole clause which consists of *subject*, *predicate* and *adverb*. Those parts are, *I* as the *subject*, *have* as *perfective*, *been* as *predicate* and *over this trail* as *adverb*, so, to make it complete, the sentence should be changed to be *I have been over this trail five times*.

In written language, those omissions will make the sentence to be ungrammatical and unclear.

19. Expletive *there* + Copula *be* Ellipsis

There as expletive and copula *be* are usually omitted in conversation. Let see the example below,

A (Madame) and B (Volkov)

(51) A: "...How many nights? It's not booked."

B: "∅Two nights, Madame. We're not in any hurry." (TR 219)

In conversation above, Madame asks Volkov about how many nights he will stay in this hotel and Volkov says that he just needs two nights. It is clear that Volkov just answers in short statement and both of them understood.

In written language, it will make the sentence to be ungrammatical and incomplete because there are many parts of the clause that have been omitted. The parts of the clause that have been omitted are *there* as *expletive* and *are* as *copula be* because the quantity of the sentence indicates the use of plural form. So, the complete sentence that must be spoken by Volkov is *there are two nights*.

20. Expletive *there* + Copula *be* + Noun Ellipsis

Expletive *there*, copula *be* and noun are usually omitted in conversation, let see the example below,

A (Rakovsky) and B (Boris)

(52) A: "How many stones?"

B: "∅ seven. Boris counted them..." (TR 130-131)

In conversation above, Rakovsky asks Boris how many stones are there and he just answers that there are seven stones by omitting *there* as expletive, *are* as copula *be* and the *stones* as *noun*. When omitting those parts in spoken language, it can be understood by each other because they meet directly but in written language, it will make the sentence to be ungrammatical and incomplete.

To make the sentence to be complete, it must be changed to be *there are seven stones*.

21. Expletive *there* + Copula *be* + Adverb Ellipsis

In conversation, expletive *there*, copula *be*, preposition and adverb are usually omitted by speaker in conversation. Let see the example below,

A (Irina) and B (Boris)

(53) A: "What was in the cupboard?"

B: "∅Two kids ∅". (TR 84)

In the dialog above, Irina asks Boris something in the cupboard and Boris just says two kids. When answering the question, Boris just speaks in short answer because he wants to minimize the conversation whether the meaning can be understood. Those parts that have been omitted are *there* as expletive, *were* as copula *be* (in past time) because the word after copula *be* is plural form, *in the cupboard* as an adverb which refers to the adverb of place.

It is clear that the omission of those parts will make the sentence to be incomplete. So, to make it complete, it must be changed to be *there were two kids in the cupboard*.

22. Auxiliary *do* + Subject + Predicate + Quantity Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits auxiliary *do*, subject, predicate, and quantity from a sentence. Let see the example below,

A (Lepkin) and b (Rakovsky)

(54) A: He said, "∅Vodka?"

B: "Vodka" Rakovsky repeated. (TR 3)

In the example above, Lepkin offers Rakovsky to dink a glass of Vodka by saying vodka in question and Rakovsky just repeats the question to express that he agrees with the offering from Lepkin. When offering vodka, Lepkin has said in short statement but both of them understand the meaning because they meet directly.

In the case above, the parts that have been omitted are, *do* as *auxiliary*, *you* as *subject* because the speaker speak directly, *want* as *predicate* which indicates the verb that indicates the offering, *a glass* which indicates the *quantity* that refers to the vodka.

So, to make the sentence complete, the question must be changed to be *do you want a glass of vodka?*

23. Subject + Modal + Copula *be* + Adjective + Preposition + Adverb Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits subject, modal, preposition and adverb in spoken language. Let see the example below,

A (Lucy) and B (Volkov)

(55) A: “We’ll be late for dinner,” Lucy whispered in his ear.

B: “Yes \emptyset ,” He whispered back.(TR 220)

In conversation above, Lucy says that she will be late for dinner with Volkov, and Volkov supports her utterance by saying yes. When answering the question, Volkov has omitted many parts of the clause because he wants to minimize the conversation when the meaning can be understood by each other.

In written language, the omission above will make the sentence to be incomplete and unclear for other people who read.

It is clear that Volkov has omitted the sentence that has been spoken by Lucy. The sentence consist of *we* as subject, *will* as modal auxiliary which indicates the use of future time, *be* as copula *be* with modal will, *late* as adjective, *for* as preposition and *dinner* as adverb. So, the sentence should be changed to be *yes, we will be late for dinner.*

24. Subject + Modal + Predicate + Preposition + Direct Object Ellipsis

Subject, modal, predicate, preposition, and direct object are usually omitted in conversation to minimize the conversation and to avoid the same words that have been spoken. Let see the example below,

A (Irina) and B (Muller)

(56) A: “Can you talk to me?”

B: “Yes \emptyset , the place is empty at the moment.” (TR 211)

In conversation above, Irina asks Muller whether he can talk to him or not and he says that he can talk to him because the place is empty. When answering the question, Irina omits the whole clause which consists of *you* as the *subject*, *can* as *modal auxiliary*, *talk* as *predicate*, *to* as *preposition* and *me* as the *direct object*.

To make the sentence complete, the whole clause must be added to the sentence to be *yes, you can talk to me.*

In conversation, the omission of those parts will make the sentence to be ungrammatical and incomplete.

25. Subject + Modal + Predicate + Direct Object + Complement Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits subject, modal, predicate and complement from a sentence. Let see the example below,

A (Muller) and B (Eloise)

(57) A: “Would you like me to make inquires? I can do it through friends of mine?”

B: “Yes, \emptyset ” She said.(TR 199)

In conversation above, Muller asks help to Eloise whether she needs him to make inquires or not and she says that she needs him by answering in short statement, “Yes”. She says in short statement because she meets directly with Muller and both of them understand the utterance.

In the case above, the parts of the clause that have been omitted are *I* as *subject of first pronoun*, *would* as *modal*, *like* as *predicate*, *you* as *direct object* which refers to Muller, and *to make inquires* as *complement*. So, to make the sentence to be grammatical and complete, the sentence should be changed to be *Yes, I would like you to make inquires .*

26. Subject + Auxiliary *did* + Negation + Predicate + Object + Adverb Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits subject, auxiliary, predicate, object and complement from the sentence. Let see the example below,

A (Irina) and B (Boris)

(58) A: "Did you kill them too?"

B: "No \emptyset . I heard shots in the bedroom" (TR 84-85)

In conversation above, Irina asks Boris whether he kills both of the boys or not and he says that he doesn't kill him by answering in short statement "*no*". In this informal situation, speaker usually omits the same words that have been spoken by speaker to avoid the repeating the same words.

In the case above, Boris has omitted the whole clause which consists of *I* as the subject, *did* as auxiliary, *not* as negation, *kill* as predicate, *them* as object and *too* as adverb. So, to make the sentence to be grammatical and complete in written language, it must be changed to be *No, I didn't kill them too*.

27. Subject + Copula be + Noun+ Predicate + Indirect Object + Direct Object Ellipsis

In conversation, the omission of subject, copula be, adverb, predicate, direct object and indirect object from one sentence often happens in conversation in informal situation. Let see the example below,

A (Volkov) and B (Lucy)

(59) A: "It's time to show me the holy relic," he said

B: "Yes \emptyset ," Lucy said.(TR 259)

From the example above, Volkov says to Lucy whether this time is for showing him the holy relic and Lucy agrees by saying "*yes*" in short statement when the meaning can be understood.

In the case above, the parts that have been omitted are *It's time to show you the holy relic*. *It* as the *subject*, *is* as the *copula be*, *time* as *adverb of time*, *to show* as *predicate* which consists of to infinitive, *you* as the *indirect object* and *the holy relic* as *direct object*. So, to make the sentence complete, it must be changed to be *yes, it's time to show you the holy relic*.

In written language or in formal situation, the omission of those parts makes the sentence to be ungrammatical and incomplete.

28. Subject + Auxiliary did + Negation + Predicate + Gerund + Adverb of place + Preposition + Direct Object +Adverb of time Ellipsis

In conversation, subject, auxiliary, predicate, adverb of place, preposition, direct object and adverb are omitted from the sentence. Let see the example below,

A (Turin) and B (Irina)

(60) A: "Did you mention returning to the Soviet Union to him at any time, Comrade Doctor?"

B: "No \emptyset ". (TR 208)

In conversation above, Turin asks Irina whether she will return to the Soviet Union or not and she answers in short statement "*no*" to avoid the repeating question from Turin.

In the case above, Irina has omitted *subject*, auxiliary *did*, *predicate*, *adverb of place*, *preposition*, *direct object* and *adverb* from the sentence which make the sentence to be incomplete and ungrammatical in written language. Subject that is omitted is *I* as the *first person* because both of the speaker meet directly, *auxiliary* that is used is *did* and it is added by *not* to indicate the negative statement, *mention* as predicate, *returning* as the gerund because the predicate is mention that must be followed by verb – ing, *to the Soviet Union* as adverb of place, *to* as preposition, *him* as direct object and *any time* is adverb of time. So, to make the sentence complete, it must be changed to be *no, I didn't mention returning to the Soviet Union to him at any time* as the following pattern,

29. Time Clause Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits time clause. Let's see the example below,

A (Lucy) and B (Lepkin)

(61) A: "What do you do when it rains?"

B: "∅ I go to *bibleotique* in the Place aux Vives and buy a book. Or I go to the Cinema."(TR 56)

From the conversation above, it is known that speaker A (Lucy) asks speaker B (Lepkin) about his activity that is usually done when the rain comes. In dialog above, Lepkin just answers the main answer without repeating the question from Lucy to minimize the conversation while the meaning can be understood by each other. The part of the clause that is omitted is time clause because it refers to the time

The time clause ellipsis in the context above will make the sentence be incomplete and unclear in written language because the word that shows about the time is omitted. So, to make the sentence complete, it must be changed to be *when it rains, I go to bibleotique in the Place aux Vives and buy a book. Or I go to the Cinema.*

30. Time Clause + Adverb Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits the main clause and also adverb. Let see the example below,

A (Natalia) and B (Gregor)

(62) A: "When will you come back again?"

B: "I don't know ∅" (TR 15)

In conversation above, Natalia asks Gregor when he will back again to the country and he says that he doesn't know the time he will come back. When answering the question, Gregor just says "*I don't know*" in short statement to avoid the same words that have been spoken by Natalia.

In the case above, the same words that have been spoken consist of time clause and adverb. Time clause in here consists of *when I will come back* and adverb consists of *again*.

To make the sentence complete, it must be added by main clause and adverb to be *I don't know when I will come back again*.

In written language, the omission of those parts makes the sentence to be incomplete.

31. Main clause + Conjunction Ellipsis

In conversation, speaker usually omits the main clause and also the conjunction. Let see the example below,

A (Irina) and B (Remus)

(63) A: "Why do you want her?"She asked. "There are other women"

B: "∅ She suits me," he said. "She knows my ways."(TR 232)

In conversation above, speaker A asks speaker B about the reason why he likes the woman and he says that he likes her because the woman suits with him. In conversation above, main clause and conjunction are omitted. The main clause that has been omitted is *I* as the *subject*, *want* as *predicate*, *her* as *object* and *because* as the *conjunction* which indicates the reason. Those omissions have the aim to make the dialog shorter.

To make the sentence to be complete, it must be changed to be *I want her because she suits me*.

In written language, those omission will make the other people who don't understand will confuse and it will make the sentence to be incomplete.

32. Main Clause + Subordinate clause Ellipsis

In conversation, main clause and subordinate clause are usually omitted by speaker. Let see the example below,

A (Irina) and B (Viktor)

(64) A: “Now, my career is finished. Viktor, what are you going to do when you find them?”

B: “Ø Kill them both, bring the cross back to Russia,” He said. (TR 224)

In conversation above, Irina says that her career is finished and she asks Viktor what he will do when he finds the people and Viktor answers that he will kill them and brings them back to Russia. He just says in short statement “*kill them both, bring the cross back to Russia* to make dialog shorter.

In the case above, the parts of main clause that are omitted are, *when* as *adverb*, *I* as *subject*, *find* as *predicate*, *them* as *direct object*, and *subordinate clause* consists of *I* as *subject*, *am going to* as the variant from *will* as *modal*. So, to make the sentence complete and grammatical in written language, it must be changed to be *when I find them, I am going to kill them both, bring the cross back to Russia*.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

From the data analysis, it can be concluded that ellipsis is a way to omit word or words from a sentence when the meaning can be understood by both of the speakers without subtracting the meaning of utterances because they meet directly. Ellipsis is often happens in conversation in informal situation between friends, father and son, husband and wife and etc.

The writer finds 64 data from the novel entitled *The Relic* (TR) by Evelyn Anthony which was published by Harper Collins Publishers (1991) in New York and *The Lonesome Gods* (TLG) by Louis L’amour which was published by Bantam Books (1983) in the United States of America. From those novels, the writer finds the kinds, characteristic, the function of the use of ellipsis in dialogs or conversation, and the effect of ellipsis in written language.

There are four kinds of ellipsis found in those novels. They are **lexical ellipsis**, **grammatical ellipsis**, **agreement ellipsis**, and **clausal ellipsis**.

Lexical ellipsis that can be found in those novels can be categorized in to four kinds. They are **subjective ellipsis**, **predicative ellipsis**, **objective ellipsis** and **adjunctive ellipsis**. **Subjective ellipsis** means the way to omit subject from a sentence. In those novels, the omission of subject can be *I*, *they*, *name of person*, and *you*. **Predicative ellipsis** is the way to omit predicate from a sentence. It can be *predicate of noun* and *predicate of adjective*. **Objective ellipsis** is the way to omit object from the sentence. It can be *Russian Champaign or vodka*, *pronoun (you)*. **Adjunctive ellipsis** means the way to omit adverb from a sentence. It can be *away* and *again*.

Grammatical ellipsis that can be found are **auxiliary do ellipsis**, **copula be ellipsis**, and **perfective ellipsis**. **Auxiliary do ellipsis** is the way to omit auxiliary *do* in front of subject in interrogative sentence. The auxiliary that is omitted in front of subject in those novels is *do* from the sentence. **Copula be ellipsis** is the way to omit copula *be* in front of subject in interrogative sentence. It can be copula *be are* and *is*. **Perfective ellipsis** is the omission of perfective (have) in front of subject in interrogative sentence and it is followed by verb III.

Agreement ellipsis that can be found in those novels are **positive agreement ellipsis** and **negative agreement ellipsis**. **Positive agreement ellipsis** shows that the speaker agrees with the idea. The words that can be used to express positive agreement are *so do I*, and *so is the boy*. **Negative agreement** is used when the speaker wants to express the agreement in negative statement. The expression of negative agreement can be *neither do I* and *I didn’t either*. **Clausal ellipsis** that can be found in those novels are the omission of **auxiliary do + subject** from a sentence. It can be the omission of auxiliary *do* and subject *you*. The omission of **subject + copula be** from a sentence. It can be *it* as the subject and *is* as the copula *be*, *this man* as subject and *is* as copula *be*, *I* as a subject and *am* as copula *be*, *the time* as subject and *is* as copula *be*. The omission of **subject + predicate** from a sentence. It can be *I like* from

the short statement books on religion. *I* has the function of subject and *like* as a predicate. The omission in clause can be **predicate + object**. For instance, *how can I* from the complete sentence *how can I take your place? Take your place* has been omitted from the sentence. *Take* as predicate and *your place* as object.

The omission in clause can be **predicate + adverb**. For instance, *I didn't want breakfast the first time we met* as the complete sentence which has been omitted to be *I didn't*. The omission of **perfective + copula be**, for instance, *you a good sailor?* From the complete sentence *have you been a good sailor?* The omission of **WH questions + copula be**, for instance, *the box?* From the complete sentence *which is the box?* The omission of **subject + copula be + predicate**, for instance, *to my apartment* from the complete sentence *we are going to my apartment*. The omission of **subject + modal + predicate** from a sentence, for instance, *no* from the complete sentence, *no, you can't see*. The omission of **auxiliary do+ subject + predicate** from a sentence, for example, *a cigarette?* From the complete sentence *do you want a cigarette?* The omission of **subject + predicate + object** from a sentence, for instance, *yes* from the complete sentence, *yes, I shot him*. The omission of **subject + perfective + predicate + object**, for example, *no* from the complete sentence *no, I have seen the paper*.

The omission of **subject + predicate + negation + object**, for instance, *no* from the complete sentence, *no, I haven't notified the coast guard*. The omission of **subject + perfective + predicate + adverb** from a sentence, for instance, *chocolate* from the complete sentence *I have got chocolate there*. The omission of **subject + copula be + adverb** from a sentence, for instance, *yes* from the complete sentence *Yes, I am alone* or *yes* from the complete sentence *Yes, Everything is all right*. The omission of **predicate + preposition + object** from a sentence, for example, *I wouldn't* from the complete sentence, *I wouldn't cope with two of them*.

Ellipsis of **subject + auxiliary + predicate + preposition** from the sentence, for instance, *The Holy cross of Saint Vladimir. Priceless. Thirteenth-century gold and jewels. It was the same. It was the cross Boris stole. And he'd taken it. Without knowing what he'd got? I could have wept thinking what I'd missed. I made inquires. I tried to find it. I'd have paid anything* from the complete sentence I'm talking about *The Holy cross of Saint Vladimir. Priceless. Thirteenth-century gold and jewels. It was the same. It was the cross Boris stole. And he'd taken it. Without knowing what he'd got? I could have wept thinking what I'd missed. I made inquires. I tried to find it. I'd have paid anything*. Ellipsis of **subject + perfective + predicate + preposition + noun** from a sentence, for instance, *five times* from the complete sentence, *I have been over this trail five times*. Ellipsis of **expletive there+ copula be** from a sentence, for instance, *two nights* from the complete sentence, *there are two nights*. Ellipsis of **expletive there + copula be + noun** from a sentence, for instance, *seven* from the complete sentence *there are seven stones*. The omission of **expletive there + copula be + adverb** from a sentence, for instance, *two kids* from the complete sentence *there were two kids in the cupboard*.

Ellipsis of **auxiliary do+ subject + predicate + quantity** from a sentence, for instance, *vodka?* From the complete sentence *do you want a glass of vodka?* The omission of **subject + modal + copula be + adjective + preposition+ adverb** from a sentence, for example, *yes*, from the complete sentence *yes, we will be late for dinner*. The omission of **subject+ modal + predicate + preposition + direct object** from a sentence, for instance, *yes* from the complete sentence *yes, you can talk to me*. The omission of **subject + modal + predicate + direct object + complement** from a sentence, for instance, *Yes*, from the complete sentence *yes, I would like you to make inquires*. The omission of **subject + auxiliary did + negation + predicate + object + adverb** from a sentence, for instance, *no* from the complete sentence *No, I didn't kill them too*. The omission of **subject + copula be +**

noun + predicate + indirect object+ direct object from a sentence, for instance, *yes* from the complete sentence *yes, it's time to show you the holy relic*. Ellipsis of **subject + auxiliary did+ negation + predicate + gerund + adverb of place + preposition + direct object + adverb of time** from a sentence, for instance, *no* from the complete sentence *no, I didn't mention returning to the Soviet Union to him at any time*.

Ellipsis of **time clause** from a sentence, for instance, *when it rains* from the complete sentence *when it rains, I go to bibleotique in the Place aux Vives and buy a book. Or I go to the Cinema*. Ellipsis of **time clause + adverb** from a sentence, for instance, *I don't know* from the complete sentence *I don't know when I will come back again*. Ellipsis of **main clause + conjunction** from a sentence, for instance *she suits me* from the complete sentence *I want her because she suits me*. Ellipsis of **main clause + subordinate clause** from the sentence, for instance *kill them both, bring the cross back to Russia*, from the complete sentence *when I find them, I am going to kill them both, bring the cross back to Russia*.

The functions of the use of ellipsis in dialogs are to avoid the repeating of the same words or group of the words that have been spoken by the speaker in conversation. Besides, it has the aim to minimize the conversation when the meaning can be understood. Moreover, the speaker wants to make the conversation shorter by deleting some parts that are understood by hearer.

In conversation or spoken language, ellipsis often happens because both of the speakers meet directly and understand the meaning although the speaker omits some parts from the sentence. This condition is very different in written language. The omission of those parts, for instance, auxiliary, copula *be*, auxiliary, subject and etc, will make the sentence to be ungrammatical because many important parts that should be written in written language.

Moreover, those omissions will make the sentence to be incomplete because of those omissions and sometimes make the reader who read novels or articles confuse the meaning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Main References

- Amri, Syaiful. 1993. *Skripsi: Elipsis Sebagai alat Kohesi dalam Teks Iklan Bahasa Perancis*. Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.
- Azar, Betty Scramper. 1989. *Understanding and Using English Grammar second edition*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- _____. 1992. *Fundamentals English Grammar second edition*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finnegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Frank, Marcella. 1972. *Modern English a practical reference guide*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Halliday, M.A.K.1994. *An Introduction to functional Grammar (second edition)*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Isa, Arie Andrasyah. 2006. *Ungkapan Vernakuler, Ekspletif dan Vokatif dalam Dialog Tiga Novel Amerika beserta Terjemahannya*. Depok: Universitas Indonesia.
- _____. 2007a. *Ungkapan vernakuler bahasa Inggris-Amerika dalam novel A Time to Kill dan The Firm karya John Grisham*. *Metalingua, Majalah Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra*; volume 5, nomor 1 Desember 2007 hal 47-61. Bandung: Balai Bahasa Bandung.

- _____. 2007b. *Ungkapan vernakuler dalam novel The Onion Field karya Josep Wambaugh*. Jurnal Ilmiah Kebahasaan dan Kesastraan; volume 35, nomor 1 Juni 2007 hal 1-16. Jakarta: Balai Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Krohn, Robert and the staff of the English language institute. 1990. *English Sentence structure*. Jakarta: Bina Rupa Aksara.
- Leech, G., Cruickshank, B., and Ivancic, R. 2006. *An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage (Seventh Impression)*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Martinus, Surawan. 2008. *Cara Cepat dan Mudah Menyelesaikan TOEFL (Reading and Vocabulary)*. Yogyakarta: Indo Era.
- Murphy, Raymond. 1994. *English Grammar in Use a reference and practice book for intermediate students (second edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, John. (Ed.). 2000. *Collins Cobuild (Collins Birmingham University Internasional Language Database), English Grammar*. London: Harpers Collins Publishers.
- Todd, Loretto. 2000. *An Introduction to Linguistics (eleventh impression)*. London: Longman York Press.
- Zaim, M. 1993. *Tesis: Pelesapan Frasa Nomina pada Konstruksi Koordinatif Bahasa Inggris*. Program Pasca Sarjana Universitas Indonesia.

Dictionary References

- Echols, John M dan Shadily, Hassan. 2003. *Kamus Indonesia-Inggris*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Jakarta
- _____. 2003. *Kamus Inggris-Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Jakarta.
- Hornby, A S. 1995. *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Web-site References

- Goldberg, Lotus Madelyn. 2005. *Verb-Stranding VP Ellipsis: A Cross-Linguistic Study*. Montréal, Québec, Canada: Department of Linguistics, McGill University.
www.lotusgoldberg.net/dissertation/Goldberg-PHD-1st-half.pdf, accessed on 23th January 2009, at 12:42.
- Ntelitheos, Dimitrios. 2004. *Syntax of Elliptical and Discontinuous Nominals*. Los Angeles: University Of California.
www.linguistics.ucla.edu/general/MATheses/Ntelitheos_UCLA_MA_2004.pdf, accessed on 23th January 2009, at 11:42.

Sources of Data

- Anthony, Evelyn. 1991. *The Relic*. New York: Harper Paperbacks.
- L'amour, Louis. 1983. *The Lonesome Gods*. New York: Bantam Books Inc.

PETUNJUK PENULISAN JURNAL

Jurnal penelitian Bahasa dan Sastra Fakultas Sastra Universitas Pamulang *Paradigma Lingua* terbit dua periode dalam setahun (Januari-Juni dan Juli-Desember). Kami mengundang para peneliti, ilmuwan, dan praktisi bidang bahasa dan sastra untuk mengirimkan hasil penelitian dan pemikirannya yang ditulis dalam bahasa Inggris untuk bahasa dan sastra Inggris dan untuk bahasa dan sastra Indonesia dalam bahasa Indonesia.

Naskah diketik dengan MS Word dengan Times New Roman font 12, spasi 1 ½ pada kertas ukuran A4, dan naskah berkisar antara 20 halaman. Sistematika penulisan adalah sebagai berikut:

JUDUL (dalam huruf kapital)

Nama penulis (non-kapital, disertai nama institusi dibawahnya)

Abstrak (kurang lebih 100 kata; berisi latar belakang, permasalahan, teori, metode, dan hasil)

Key words: (setelah titik dua kata-kata kunci ditulis miring, huruf pertama kapital)

INTRODUCTION (pendahuluan, mencakup latar belakang, masalah, dan tujuan)

REVIEW OF LITERATURE/THEORETICAL REVIEW (ulasan teori)

ANALYSIS (pembahasan)

CONCLUSION (kesimpulan)

REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY/WORKS-CITED (daftar pustaka)

Acuan Penulisan

- Setiap sumber yang dikutip harus tercantum dalam daftar pustaka.
- Kutipan kurang dari tiga baris dimasukkan ke dalam tulisan, kecuali lebih maka harus berbentuk paragraf menggantung (indented/menjorok ke dalam) dengan spasi tunggal.

- Penulis yang dikutip ditulis dengan urutan: nama akhir, tahun penerbitan, dan halaman. Contoh: DiYanni (2000: 35) atau (DiYanni, 2000:35)

Penulisan Daftar Pustaka

- Referensi dapat berupa kombinasi buku, jurnal ilmiah, artikel internet, dan karya sastra.
- Sumber umumnya ditulis dengan urutan: nama akhir, nama kedua/pertama, titik, tahun penerbitan (boleh dalam kurung atau tidak, tapi harus konsisten), titik, judul buku (cetak miring atau garis bawah; konsisten), titik, kota penerbitan, titik dua, dan nama penerbit, titik. Contoh:

Buku

DiYanni, Robert. (2000). *Literature: Introduction to Fiction, Poetry, and Drama*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Jurnal

Savignon, S. J. (2000). *Communicative Language Teaching*. In M. Byram (Ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. (pp. 124-129). London: Routledge.

Artikel/jurnal internet

Kelly, Charles, Lawrence Kelly, Mark Offner & Bruce Vorland. (2002). Effective Ways to Use Authentic Materials with ESL/EFL Students. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. VIII, No. 11.
<http://www.iteslj.org/Techniques/Kelly-Authentic.html>
 (retrieved on March 14, 2010)

Naskah yang masuk akan kami seleksi berdasarkan tema dan persyaratan penulisan yang telah ditetapkan. Selanjutnya naskah akan dinilai baik isi maupun sistematika penulisannya oleh tim penyusun/penyunting. Naskah yang memenuhi syarat akan dikembalikan kepada penulis untuk dilengkapi atau diperbaiki. Naskah dapat dikirim melalui e-mail ke: djasminar@yahoo.com dan cc ke yan.stba@yahoo.co.id.