University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Sentence Structure of Twitter Messages

Lukáš Klika

Bachelor Thesis

2017

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: **2015/2016**

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení:	**Lukáš Klika**
Osobní číslo:	**H14059**
Studijní program:	**B7310 Filologie**
Studijní obor:	**Anglický jazyk pro odbornou praxi**
Název tématu:	**Struktura vět twitterových zpráv**
Zadávající katedra:	**Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování:

Cílem bakalářské práce je analyzovat využívání elipsy v twitterových zprávách. Na základě studia odborné lingvistické literatury autor nejprve popíše strukturu anglické věty z hlediska komunikačního dynamismu a poté se zaměří na způsoby ekonomizace textu. Hlavní pozornost bude zaměřena na elipsu jako jednoho z častých prostředků zkracování vět. Pro analýzu student vytvoří jazykový korpus, který bude zahrnovat věty s elipsou, které se vyskytly v twitterových zprávách rodilých i nerodilých mluvčích angličtiny. Výsledky obou analýz budou následně porovnány s cílem najít typické rozdíly mezi jednotlivými skupinami přispěvatelů.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Seznam odborné literatury:

Aarts, Bas. 2011. Oxford Modern English Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Alexander, L. G., and R. A. Close. 1988. Longman English Grammar. London: Longman.
Azar, Betty Scrampfer. 1999. Understanding and Using English Grammar. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
Biber, Douglas, and Randolph Quirk. 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. New York: Longman.
Carter, Ronald, and Michael McCarthy. 2006. Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide: Spoken and Written English Grammar and Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Collins Cobuild. 1990. English Grammar. London: Collins.
Halliday, M. A. K., and Jonathan Webster. 2014. Text Linguistics: The How and Why of Meaning. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing.
Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Jacobs, Roderick A. 1995. English Syntax: A Grammar for English Language Professionals. New York: Oxford University Press.
Leech, Geoffrey N., Benita Cruickshank, and Roz Ivanic. 1989. An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage. London: Edward Arnold.
Quirk, Randolph. 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **PhDr. Šárka Ježková, Ph.D.**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **30. dubna 2016**

Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **31. března 2017**

prof. PhDr. Karel Rýdl, CSc.
děkan

L.S.

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Pardubice, Studentská 84

doc. Šárka Bubíková, Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2016

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracoval samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využil, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury. Byl jsem seznámen s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Souhlasím s prezenčním zpřístupněním své práce v Univerzitní knihovně.

V Pardubicích dne 29. 6. 2017

Lukáš Klika

Acknowledgment:

I would like to express my sincere thanks to PhDr. Šárka Ježková, Ph.D., my supervisor, for the support and guidance she had provided.

ANNOTATION

This bachelor thesis focuses on the usage of ellipsis in twitter messages by native and non-native speakers of English. The paper presents ellipsis, its categories and criteria. It also introduces the terms of recoverability and position of ellipsis. Additionally, it covers the clausal elements which are commonly ellipted. The analysis of twitter messages focuses on the frequency of ellipsis in tweets of both native and non-native speakers of English in order to find differences in the usage of ellipsis.

KEYWORDS

Ellipsis, twitter, reduction, recoverability, situational recoverability, structural recoverability, anaphoric recoverability, cataphoric recoverability

NÁZEV

Struktura vět twitterových zpráv

ANOTACE

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá užitím elipsy v twitterových zprávách rodilých i nerodilých mluvčích angličtiny. Práce popisuje elipsu, její kategorie a kritéria. Také představuje termíny návratnost a pozice elipsy. Následně pojednává o větných členech, které bývají obvykle vynechávány. Analýza twitterových zpráv se zaměřuje na četnost výskytu elipsy v tweetech rodilých i nerodilých mluvčí angličtiny, a to za účelem nalezení odlišností při použití elipsy.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Elipsa, twitter, redukce, návratnost, situační návratnost, strukturální návratnost, anaforická návratnost, kataforická návratnost

Contents

List of tables

0. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to analyse the usage of ellipsis in twitter messages. The paper consists of two parts – the theoretical part and the analytical part.

The theoretical part will firstly introduce reduction, as it is a device used to avoid repetition, which is a main focus of ellipsis. The following chapter will inform about recoverability which is crucial for the usage of ellipsis, as well as its analysis. The next chapters will move onto devices used for the purpose of economisation of a text. Ellipsis is one of the mentioned devices, and it will be analysed in detail in a separate chapter.

The subchapters of the chapter about ellipsis will inform about the differences between ellipsis and substitution, then Quirk's criteria of ellipsis, enriched using the definitions of other authors, will be introduced. Moreover, various types of ellipsis will be defined based on Quirk's criteria. The ellipsis will be then classified based on its formal type, functional type, and recoverability. Finally, a chapter containing a detailed analysis of the ellipsis of major clause elements will be included.

The analysis will start out with an introduction of corpus and used methodology, as well as a brief introduction to the function of twitter, and why it was chosen for the analysis. The corpus will be then analysed for the instances of ellipsis which will be distinguished based on their recoverability, position, and type of ellipted clausal element. A subchapter will be then created for each ellipted element, containing results of the analysis, the frequency of usage, and the variants in which the given ellipsis occurs. Also, a separate chapters will be dedicated to the type of recoverability and position in which ellipsis occurs. All three factors will be analysed to find a difference between the usage of ellipsis by native and non-native speakers of English.

The final part of the analysis will be a summary of results, which will compare the results of the analysis with a goal to determine the habits of native and non-native speakers of English when using ellipsis.

1. Reduction

Generally, Quirk describes reduction as a device to avoid redundancy or repetition. However, the boundaries of reduction are set by English syntax (1985:859). A number of devices can be used for the purpose of reduction. Quirk also mentions that the motivation for reduction is based on the general preference of English speakers to use the most reduced form. (1985:860) This means that there is a strong preference to use ellipsis much more than pro-forms if there is an option to do so. As an example we can use a sentence:

[Ex.1] *He may come to school, but it is unlikely that he will (come to school). [ellipsis]*

He may come to school, but it is unlikely that he will do so. [pro-form]

Quirk suggests that the usage of reduction may not only affect the economy, but also the clarity of sentences. (1985: 860) It is clear that mentioning only the necessary information does not overshadow the true meaning of a sentence. This fact can be demonstrated by an example:

[Ex.2] A: *Have you finished your meal?* B: <I have> *Not yet.* <*finished my meal.*>

The answer of speaker B has a clear meaning in both reduced and non-reduced form, however, the reduced form avoids uttering unnecessary words. Nevertheless, Quirk warns about the usage of reduction in situations, where it would lead to ambiguity, or any other kind of difficulty for the interpreter. (1985:860) Therefore, one thing to consider while using reduction should be the recoverability of text.

2. Recoverability

According to Quirk, the full form of what has been reduced is generally recoverable from context (1985: 861). The context might be either linguistic, or from other sources. Quirk mentions specifically: textual recoverability, which means that the full form is recoverable from a neighbouring part of the text, situational recoverability, which means that the full form is recoverable from the extralinguistic situation, and structural recoverability, which means that the full form is recoverable not through knowledge of context, but simply through knowledge of grammatical structure (1985: 862). Recoverability can be further distinguished between anaphoric and cataphoric. As anaphoric recoverability refers to an element, which has already been mentioned, it is no surprise that this kind of recoverability is the most common.

To understand why recoverability is the important factor, it should be mentioned that words are generally omitted where understanding can be achieved without repetition (Quirk 1985:862)

Biber mentions that the ellipted elements need to be precisely recoverable from the linguistic or situational context. He indicates that the ellipted parts can be added to the text without changing the meaning of clause, or producing ungrammatical structure (1999: 156). Biber also puts ellipsis into groups based on recoverabilitiy.

Halliday and Hasan mention that ellipsis deals with a huge amount of presupposing. They use an example:

[Ex.3] *"Hardly anyone left the country before the war."*

To fully understand this sentence, the two meanings of the word "country" need to be distinguished. One can mean a unit of nation, and the other rural areas. The meanings of the word left, which can either mean for a holiday, or emigration, need to be also distinguished. (Halliday, and Hasan 1995: 142) After we achieve this, we are able to fully understand the sentence and possible omitted elements. The result is similar to the term "recoverability" used by Quirk.

3. Ellipsis

Ellipsis is a form of substitution, which can be described as grammatical omission, in contrast to other kinds of omission in language (Quirk 1999: 883). This omission is describable in terms of morphological units (morphemes), or grammatical units (words). Quirk distributes ellipsis into groups based on recoverability – textual ellipsis with the subgroups of anaphoric, and cataphoric, situational ellipsis, and structural ellipsis.

Biber, on the other hand, distinguishes between initial ellipsis, medial ellipsis, and final ellipsis, based on the location in the clause. He further puts ellipsis into groups based on the recoverability of the evidence - textual ellipsis with the subgroups of coordinated clauses, comparative clauses, and question-answer sequences, and situational ellipsis (1999: 156-158).

Therefore, we can see a notable difference between the groups, as Biber does not mention a group of structural ellipsis.

Both authors, however, include a group of situational ellipsis. This type of ellipsis does not depend on the linguistic context, is mostly initial, and is usually quite clear both in meaning, and in recoverability.

Ellipsis is very common in coordinated clauses which share elements with a preceding clause. This might be shown using example:

[Ex.4] *The boy who came to the bar was completely broke, and <he> was hoping that someone would buy him a beer.*

For ellipsis in comparative clauses we might use an example:

[Ex.5] *She looks younger than my brother <does>.*

It might look like ellipsis in question-answer sequences are not needed to be analysed for the purpose of this paper. However, twitter is sometimes used even to request an information. Therefore, we might encounter messages similar to [Ex.6]:

[Ex.6] *Q: When is he coming back to NY?*

A: <He's coming back> Next Sunday.

Halliday and Hasan chose completely different groups, and used the categories of nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis. (1995: 143) These categories are different from those used by Quirk, and Biber.

Halliday and Hasan chose a different approach to ellipsis, which they define as a 'substitution by zero.' However, this substitution has a rule. It is important that the ellipted element is understood which means that it is clear what has been ellipted. This rule is very similar to the term 'recoverability' used by Quirk. (1995:142)

3.1. Ellipsis vs. Substitution

Quirk's view of ellipsis is that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between ellipsis and substitution. In general, the term pro-form substitution means to replace using unique expression. Quirk's examples demonstrate it very clearly:

[Ex.7] *Our house is quite different from theirs. <their house>* (substitution)
Our house is quite different from his. <house> (ellipsis)

Many buildings were damaged, but none <no building> was destroyed. (substitution)
Many buildings were damaged, but few <buildings> were destroyed. (ellipsis)

Quirk explains that the technical difference is that the word he has the same genitive form in the determinative and head functions (his/his) in contrast to my/mine, your/yours, etc. Therefore, the choice has been made purely based on the irregularity of English pronoun morphology. (1985: 891)

Halliday and Hasan mention that both ellipsis and substitution deal with a large amount of presupposition. Sentences or clauses may contain structural hints which have a goal to presuppose a preceding item, functioning as a source of a missing information. Therefore, substituted elements leave structural gaps which can be filled from elsewhere. Substitution, however, uses a specific word as a place-marker, while ellipsis uses nothing. Therefore, Halliday and Hasan consider substitution and ellipsis to be very similar, which supports their claim that ellipsis is basically a 'substitution by zero.' (1995:143)

3.2. Criteria of ellipsis

According to Quirk, ellipsis is a type of omission which can be distinguished from other types of omissions if it meets all the criteria specified in the following paragraphs. (1985: 885)

3.2.1. Recoverability of the ellipted words

Ellipted words must be fully recoverable from the linguistic context. This includes even words which are presupposed from the previous parts of the sentence. However, even when full recoverability is achieved, ambiguity can still be encountered. Quirk uses a perfect example:

[Ex.8] "The suspect admits stealing car from a garage, but he can't remember which."

In this example, the word which could either mean "which car" or "which garage." (1985: 885)

Halliday and Hasan also note that omitted elements must be recoverable from the neighbouring parts of text, which they call 'presupposition'. Nevertheless, this term generally means the same – that he omitted elements are still understood. Therefore, an elliptical item leaves a blank spot that needs to be filled out from elsewhere. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 144)

3.2.2. Grammatically defective elliptical construction

Quirk defines this criterion using the following words:

> "Typically, ellipsis is postulated in order to explain why some normally obligatory element of a grammatical sentence is lacking. If such 'gaps' did not occur, there would be no obvious grammatical motive for invoking the concept of ellipsis in the first place." (Quirk 1985: 885)

There is a number of structures which are grammatically defective, however, they do not meet the criterion of perfect recoverability. Once again, Quirk's example word 'Thanks' perfectly illustrates this situation. Even if the word 'Thanks' may operate as a complete utterance, we could expand the word in various ways. Therefore, the criterion of recoverability is not fulfilled and we cannot consider the structure to be elliptical.

Halliday and Hasan suggest that ellipsis occurs when its structure does not express all the required features. They note, however, that it is not the structure itself that makes it elliptical. (1995: 144)

However, it is important to be careful when combining recoverability with grammatically defective constructions. It is possible that if we fill out the gaps with the missing words, it might result in ungrammatical sentence. Therefore, another criterion is needed. (Quirk 1985: 886)

3.2.3. The insertion of ellipted words results in a grammatical sentence with unchanged meaning

This criterion can be illustrated using the example:

[Ex.9] [a] *He always wakes up earlier than I <wake up>*

[b] *He always wakes up earlier than me. <wake up>*

The insertion of the ellipted structure results in a grammatical sentence only in example [a]. Therefore, the example [a] is a more definite example of ellipsis than the example [b]. (Quirk 1985, 886)

Also, it should be noted that the meaning of the sentence should not be altered if the elliptical structure is filled out with the missing words. This would break the criterion. (Quirk 1985: 886)

3.2.4. The missing words are textually recoverable, and are present in the text in the exactly same form.

These are actually two criteria with a close relation. Textual recoverability means that ellipsis is basically guaranteed, as it helps to determine which term has been ellipted. However a stronger criterion exists within the textual recoverability. This criterion can be illustrated using the following example:

[Ex.10] [c] *She might sing tonight, but I don't think she will <sing tonight>.*

[d] *She rarely sings, so I don't think she will <sing> tonight.*

While the ellipted expression of the example [c] is exactly the same, the ellipted expression of the example [d] is morphologically different. However, as Quirk states, this criterion is only significant in several cases. (Quirk 1985: 887)

The following example might demonstrate the usage of the criterion in a coordinated sentence:

[Ex.11] [e] *The club always has paid its way, and always will <pay its way>.*

[f] *The club always has <paid its way>, and always will pay its way.*

Both of the examples violate the criterion of the exact match. However, the example [e] is, according to Quirk, widely considered to be acceptable, while the example [f] is regarded as incorrect. However, for the purpose of analysis, even the slightly adjusted ellipted words will be considered as valid.

3.3. Types of Ellipsis

Using the criteria mentioned in chapter 3.2, Quirk defines several types of ellipsis. The groups are based on which criteria are fulfilled by a specific type.

3.3.1. Strict ellipsis

If the ellipsis fulfils all of the criteria mentioned in chapter 4.1, the ellipsis is called strict, and occurs mainly in coordination. Therefore, the resulting elliptical structure will be textually recoverable, have a grammatically defective construction, the missing words may be inserted in an exact same form, and if inserted, a grammatical sentence will be a result. This is the most definitive example of ellipsis that may be encountered. (Quirk 1985: 889)

3.3.2. Standard ellipsis

The only criterion this type of ellipsis does not meet is the criterion of 'exact match.' Quirk's example might be used to demonstrate this type:

[Ex.12] *She sings better than I can <sing>* (Quirk 1985: 889)

The criterion of exact match cannot be fulfilled, as the word 'can' has to be followed only by an infinitive. However, this does not seem to be problematic in most cases of ellipsis. This type of ellipsis is also used by Quirk when analysing the cases of 'general ellipsis.'

3.3.3. Quasi-ellipsis

If the ellipsis fulfils only the criteria mentioned in chapters 3.2.1., and 3.2.4 the ellipsis is called quasi-ellipsis. This occurs if the replaced expression is containing a substitute from, which is a grammatical variant of the word or construction. This also applies to do-support constructions. In this construction a position of stranded operator is taken by an unstressed dummy operator. (Quirk 1985: 891)
However, Quirk considers this to be more of a case of substitution rather than ellipsis. (1985: 889) Therefore, quasi-ellipsis will not be regarded as ellipsis for the purpose of the analysis.

3.3.4. Situational ellipsis

This type of ellipsis does not satisfy the criterion mentioned in 3.2.4. In other words, it is not recoverable textually, but rather from an extralinguistic context or situation. It is analysed in detail in chapter 3.4.2.

3.3.5. Structural ellipsis

In this case, the missing expression is not recoverable from a neighbouring part of a text, but rather from the structure of the sentence. Quirk mentions that a no clear line exists between situational and structural ellipsis. One of the most frequent cases of structural ellipsis is the omission of *that* in the sentences such as "*I believe <that> you are mistaken."* (Quirk 1985: 900) As the omission of *that* does not create a grammatically defective construction, this type does not satisfy the criterion mentioned in 3.2.2. Additionally the word *that* cannot be recovered from the neighbouring text, but rather from the structure of the sentence, so the first part of the criterion in 3.2.4 is not satisfied, and the second part of it cannot be applied. A result is a so-called 'structural ellipsis', as the elements can be recovered due to the knowledge of the structure of a sentence.

Structural ellipsis is also present in headlines, book titles, diaries, telegrams, etc. The reason for this is that written text, if used as a headline, has to be very brief to quickly

catch a reader's eye and hook him into reading further. Therefore, the economical devices such as ellipsis have to be used for the purpose of the reduction of a text. Quirk also notes that closed class items are omitted not only in initial, but also in medial position when used in styles known as 'headlinese' and 'telegraphese.'

3.3.6. Weak ellipsis

Quirk also states that the boundaries of ellipsis cannot be easily defined. Therefore, for the cases where the number of expressions which can be inserted is limited we may use the term *weak ellipsis*.

3.4. The classification of ellipsis

Quirk's viewpoint on ellipsis is that we cannot tell where and how will ellipsis take place if we do not distinguish three factors: recoverability type, functional type, formal type. (1985: 892)

3.4.1. Recoverability

This type can be further distinguished into situational recoverability, structural recoverability, and textual recoverability. Textual recoverability also consists of subgroups of anaphoric and cataphoric recoverability. Textual recoverability is the most frequent type. (Halliday and Hasan 1995:143)

3.4.1.1. Anaphoric and cataphoric

If final ellipsis is the dominant category of formal type, the dominant category of recoverability type is definitely anaphoric ellipsis. As for cataphoric ellipsis, it usually occurs in sentences, which are subordinate to the antecedents. Quirk's example may be used to demonstrate this:

[Ex.13] *If you want me to <lend you my pen>, I'll lend you my pen.*

Those who prefer to <stay indoors>, can stay indoors.

The examples are self-explanatory. (Quirk 1985: 895)

Halliday and Hassan mention that in the majority of instances, the presupposed item is mentioned in a preceding text. Therefore, a typical occurrence of ellipsis is anaphoric. (1995:144)

For the analytical part, it is expected that twitter messages will contain mostly textual anaphoric recoverability.

3.4.2. Situational ellipsis

As mentioned in chapter 4.3. in regards to situational and structural ellipsis, some types of ellipsis are not dependent on the linguistic context. In these cases the interpretation may depend on knowledge of specific extralinguistic context. The following sentence is a great example:

[Ex.14] [1] <Did you> Get it?

[2] <Do you> Get it?

Example [1] refers to a specific object or action.

Example [2] refers to a state of mind, as we could rephrase this sentence as "Do you understand?"

Quirk also suggests that the term *situational ellipsis* may apply even to cases of weak ellipsis, and cases where it is quite clear which expression has been omitted. In some cases, the situational ellipsis can be even final e.g. in a sentence *How could you <...>?* when questioning someone's decision. With the exception of these infrequent sentences, the situational ellipsis is mostly initial. The ellipsis then omits subject, operator, or even both. In general, it can be said that in spoken English situational ellipsis covers mostly the elements preceding the stressed part of the sentence.

Even Halliday and Hasan cover situational ellipsis. However, they use a term 'exophoric reference,' as the ellipsis depends on extralinguistic context. However, for the purpose of this paper, Quirk's term will be used, as it seems to be much clearer.

Although situational ellipsis occurs mostly in spoken English, it is still possible that it can be found in twitter messages in several cases. It is expected that it might be used as a reaction to the events which the members of the group that will be analysed frequently attends.

3.4.2.1. Ellipsis in declarative sentences

Situational ellipsis in some cases also allows for a subject of a sentence to be ellipted. This ellipsis usually occurs with 1st person pronoun *I* or 2nd person pronoun *you*. The ellipsis of 2nd person statements occurs only with the addition of tag question. 3rd person pronouns *he*, *she,* or *they* may be also ellipted. Another occurrence of subject ellipsis may be with *it*. This occurs when anticipatory *it* is used in combination with extraposition. Another case when *it* is ellipted may be in sentences like *It is cold,* where *it* is a so-called 'prop' subject. Existential *there* might be also ellipted at the beginning of a sentence. For this case, Quirk also notes that the elliptical construction is very unlikely to contain the modal *will*, while its negative form *won't* is quite common. (Quirk 1985: 897)

Moreover, the subject may be also ellipted in combination with an operator. The most common variants are the ellipsis of the 1st person pronoun + be, it plus is, and the 1st person pronoun followed by an operator other than be. It is important to note that the word *we* cannot be omitted as a single unit, but it must rather be ellipted with its operator for example in *we're*. Quirk also suggests that this rule applies for many speakers even to the pronoun *I*. (Quirk 1985: 898) For *it* plus is the same rules are applied as when trying to ellipt just *I* alone.

3.4.2.2. Ellipsis in interrogative sentences

The rules of ellipsis of subject and operator in interrogative sentences are quite simple. If the omission occurs in a yes/no question, then the elliptical structure begins with a subject complement or an adjunct. Omitting auxiliary operators *be, have,* and *do* results in the elliptical structure beginning with a non-finite verb, which may be supported by an adverbial.

With interrogative sentences it is possible to come across a sentence where just the operator is ellipted, and the subject is pronounced as usual. Quirk notes that this is the case when the subject is stressed. (Quirk 1985: 899)

3.4.3. Functional type

While examining the cases of textual ellipsis, the relation of the original construction to the elliptical construction has to be considered. In several cases the ellipsis may be actually freer than in other cases. For example an ellipsis in coordinate and comparative sentences is, generally, freer than in conditional if-clauses. Therefore, it is vital to create categories of constructions where the relation between an original and an elliptical construction has to be considered. Quirk uses the categories of general ellipsis and special ellipsis. (Quirk 1985: 892)

While general ellipsis is a category where the relation is not important, special ellipsis is a complete opposite, as the omission is determined based on the relation between the antecedent and the elliptical construction.

3.4.4. Formal type

In regards to formal type of the ellipsis, Quirk considers the two main categories to be initial, and final ellipsis. Quirk comments on the category of medial ellipsis, saying that it is mostly just a structural illusion resulting from the unusual length of the sentence. Therefore, medial ellipsis can be usually treated as a special case of initial or medial ellipsis. (Quirk 1985: 893)

Generally, it can be stated that initial ellipsis concerns the subject and operator, and final ellipsis is applies to the predication. Final ellipsis also predominates over initial and medial ellipsis. When considering the additional elements of a clause such as conjunctions and optional adverbials, these less important features tend to be avoided by the elliptical construction. (Quirk 1985: 893)

3.5. Ellipsis of clausal elements

Halliday and Hasan claim that ellipsis within a single sentence may be explained on a structural level, as the relations within a sentence are expressed in structural terms.

Therefore, the types of ellipsis described by Halliday and Hasan are mostly focused on ellipsis between multiple sentences, as those cannot be explained by a structure of the sentence because there are no structural relations between sentences. (1995: 146)

While Quirk, Biber, and Huddleston are more concerned with recoverability and finding a source of ellipsis, Halliday and Hasan define ellipsis mostly from a point of view of a potential user. In other words, Halliday and Hasan aim to define specific rules for the sentences which are to-be ellipted.

3.5.1. Nominal ellipsis

The structure of nominal ellipsis consists of head with the addition of premodifier, and postmodifier. The elements of modifiers are Deictic, Numerative, Epithet, Classifier, and Qualifier. Deictic modifier is usually represented by a determiner. Numerative defines a numeral or any other quantifier. Epithet is generally an adjective, and finally Classifier a noun. Halliday and Hasan mention that Qualifier is usually represented by a relative clause, or prepositional phrase. (1995: 147) Head is always present in a form of common noun, proper noun or pronoun.

Proper nouns generally describe individual things and may be supported by descriptive modifiers. However, these modifiers are not subject to ellipsis.

Common nouns usually need to be further specified, so it is common to encounter modifying elements like deictic, numerative, epithet and classifier. Certain circumstances allow us to omit those common nouns, in which case their position of a head is taken by one of the other elements. Quirk notes that some of these items in the presupposed group may be repudiated by the elliptical group. (1985: 901)

To summarise this, non-elliptical nominal group is any person, object, state, or relation representing the head. Elliptical nominal group does not express this element, and the function of head is taken by one of the modifiers. Halliday and Hasan also mention a frequency in which types of modifiers take the function of a head. This may be expressed by a following relation: (1995: 147-8)

Deictic = Numerative > Epithet > Classifier

The function of head is mostly taken by a deictic or numerative, less frequently by an epithet. Classifier takes a function of head only in very rare cases, as a classifier is usually a noun which could lead to misinterpretation. Halliday gives a perfect example of this misinterpretation, as we cannot replace *a tall brick chimney* by a *tall brick*. (1995:148)

A function of nominal ellipsis is, therefore, to upgrade a status of modifier to the status of head. If we need to analyse the text and fill the ellipted element back, we have two options. We may push down the status of a modifier functioning as head and fill the missing head, or we may keep the elliptical group, but add the partitive qualifier. The second option, however, is viable only under specific conditions.

> The partitive is possible only under certain conditions: generally, when the elliptical group designates some aggregate – a subset, fraction, quantity or collective – that is different from that designated by the presupposed group. (Halliday and Hasan, 1995:148)

Simple or partitive form are two options which can always be used to replace an elliptical group with its non-elliptical equivalent. Halliday and Hasan do not forget to mention that partitive type is a regular form of English which is, in some cases, even obligatory. (1995: 149).

To fully understand the nominal ellipsis, each type of modifier needs to be analysed separately. This will be done in the following subchapters, which are mostly based on Halliday, as Quirk tends to focus only on the most frequent examples, while Halliday tries to analyse every possible outcome of ellipsis.

3.5.1.1. Specific deictics

Halliday and Hasan, in regards to the elliptical usage of deictics, mention that:

> The elliptical usage of deictic elements is a major source of cohesion in English texts. The Deictic is the element in the nominal group that relates to the 'here and now', linking the thing referred to to its verbal and situational context. It is natural, therefore, that it should be typically used as a means of harking back to a thing that has already been mentioned, while at the same time recontextualizing it by anaphoric or exophoric reference. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 159)

Deictics are further divided into the groups of proper deictics and post-deictics. Proper deictics consist of specific deictics and non-specific deictics, which can be combined using partitive quantifier. This part is concerned with the specific ones, which are represented by possessives, demonstratives, and 'the.' (Halliday and Hasan, 1995:155)

If possessives occur as a head, it signals ellipsis. This applies both to nominals, and pro-nominals.

Demonstratives occur in ellipsis very frequently, mostly in anaphoric reference, as they are reference items on their own. Whenever a noun head or a substitute *one(s)* can be used in the nominal group, it is an example of ellipsis.

Halliday and Hasan define the elliptical usage of the word *the* using the following words:

> The word *the* does not operate elliptically; since its function is to signal that the 'thing' designated is fully defined, but by something other than *the* itself, it normally requires another item with it, as in *the two*, *the small (one)*, *the one that got away*. Where it could have occurred elliptically it is replaced by its non-reduced cognate from *that*. (Halliday and Hasan, 1995:157)

3.5.1.2. Non-specific deictics

The words *each, every, any, either, no, neither, a, some, all,* and *both* are all non-specific deictics. All of these, except for *every*, can exist as a head of elliptical nominal, however, *a* only in a form of *one*, and *no* only in a form of *none*. Moreover, Quirk suggests that it is not acceptable for a noun phrase to be ellipted when preceded by an indefinite article and another modifier. (1985: 901)

An interesting feature of the word *one* is that it may be confusing whether it is used elliptically, or as a substitute. A difference is clear in its plural form, as a plural of *one* is *ones* if used in substitution, but if used as a plural of the determiner *one* changes to *some*. (Halliday and Hasan 1995:159)

The exceptions to the rule of combination of specific and non-specific deictics, mentioned in 4.3.1.1., are the words *both* and *all*, as these two can be joined to another determiner, forming a so-called pre-deictic position. The function of *all* and *both* is to presuppose a certain number of entities. However, the presupposed items may already be a member of already presupposed group. *Mother* and *father* can be substituted for *both*, while

the word *parents*, already consisting of the words *mother* and *father*, can be further substituted for *both* for example in a sentence:

[Ex.15] *You can please <u>parents</u> or you can please <u>children</u>, but you cannot please <u>both</u>.*

However, when mentioning multiple groups, a specific link must exist between the words belonging in one bracket. In other words, it must be clear which groups belong together. The following example demonstrates an incorrect way to use this type of deictic, as there is no clear sign of *the boy's parents* and *his teachers* being treated as a single set.

> The boy's parents had no time for him. At school, his teachers could make little contact. Yet the boy had a lot of ability, if he'd tried. I suppose both were at fault, really. (Halliday and Hassan, 1995:156)

Generally, it can be said that these words presuppose a certain number of entities, expressed in a form of plural noun, or different singular or plural nouns. These entities usually form a set which can be combined in one nominal group. For example, *parents* usually mean both *a mother* and *a father*. Halliday and Hasan mention that if it is unclear which items are grouped together, it may result in an ambiguity. (1995:156) This ambiguity is best shown in the following example:

> The father and the mother were so busy making money that the two children were left to their own devices. Naturally both were resentful. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 156)

The word *both* creates an ambiguity, as it is unclear if it includes the children, the children and their parents, or just parents. Even though the intended meaning can be assumed, it might be better to avoid these types of constructions to prevent possible misunderstanding. Moreover, this ambiguity is in conflict with Quirk's recoverability principle.

The words *either*, *neither*, and *each* have similar functions with *either* and *neither* presupposing two sets, and *each* presupposing two or more. When talking about multiple sets, an ambiguity may be encountered in a same way as with *all* and *both*. The words *either* and *neither* also have their non-dual equivalents in the words *any* and *no*, which can occur elliptically in singular and mass nouns. (Halliday and Hasan 1995:158) A more detailed description of these words is that *no* and *neither* are negatives, and are used in declarative clauses which have a positive verb, while *any* and *either* occur in hypothetical or interrogative clauses which have a negative verb or positive verb,

but the meaning is 'it does not matter which.' (Halliday and Hasan 1995:158) The word *any*, when used elliptically, also denies a numeral used in the presupposed group and usually results in a singular, unless modified by a numeral. If used in interrogative, hypothetical, or negative clauses, it neutralizes the difference between singular and plural. When used as a head of a nominal clause or as a subject, both singular and plural verbs can be used. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 158)

An elliptical form of the word *no* is *none,* and even though it was originally treated as a singular, it is no longer true, as its distinction of singular or plural is neutralized when using negative *no*.

A special case of this group is the word *some* which works as a non-singular form of the indefinite article. If used as an elliptical head of the clause, it is always in its non-reduced form [sʌm]. The nominal group it presupposes can be either singular or plural and any numeral is repudiated.

3.5.1.3. Post-deictics

In the nominal group, adjectives fill the role of post-deictic elements. Halliday and Hasan mention that up to forty of them are commonly used and give a list of the most frequent ones, which include *other, same, different, identical, usual, regular, certain, odd, famous, well-known, typical, obvious*. (1995: 159) These words are used in combination with determiners and may be followed by a numerative. On the other hand, adjectives used in their normal function of epithet must follow a numerative. Halliday gives a number of examples, which are best demonstrated using the following table: (1995: 159)

Table 1

Deictic	**Epithet**
The identical three questions	Three identical questions
The usual two comments	Two usual comments
A different three people	Three different people
The odd few ideas	A few odd ideas

The obvious first place to stop	The first obvious place to stop

Same and *other* are the two adjectives which commonly occur in deictic function and are used elliptically. The elliptical usage of *same* is treated as a substitution, as it occurs in sentences like *I will have the same.* The word *other* is used in combination of either specific or non-specific deictic. However, when used as a head of a sentence, it is transformed into its plural form *others*. Similarly to *any* the presupposed nominal group does not have to be in same number, and numerals are repudiated. When used with specific deictics, the word *other(s)* presupposes that a nominal group has already been specified, and it usually refers to the last remaining members of that group. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 160) In general, it can be said that one sentence introduces members of a nominal group, and the next sentence separates the group by giving information about a part of the group. The rest of the group is then referred to as *the other(s).*

3.5.1.4. Numeratives

Numeratives are another element which commonly occurs as a head in elliptical construction. Numerals have three subcategories of *ordinals*, *cardinals*, and *indefinite quantifiers.*

Ordinals are frequently used elliptically in combination with *the*, or any possessive as deictic, and include *first, second, last, third, fourth, etc.* A special function of ordinals is that they may be presupposing even without the use of elliptical construction, as *the second* usually presupposes that something must have been *the first*, and so on. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 161)

Cardinals also frequently occur elliptically, and if preceded by a deictic, it must be a deictic in an appropriate number. The word presupposed by both cardinals and ordinals may be singular or plural, but cannot be mass, as mass nouns are uncountable. The exception is if there is also a measure word present. Halliday and Hasan mention an example of *"Have some more tea" w*hich can be interpreted as presupposing *cup(s).* (1995: 162)

Indefinite quantifiers are words like *much, many, more, most, few, several, a little, lots, a bit, hundreds, etc.* These are also frequently present in elliptical structures, however, due to being indefinite, they usually are not used in combination with a deictic. The exceptions include *a lot*, and comparative forms like *more, fewer,* and *less* which may be preceded by no or any. (1995: 162) Halliday and Hassan also compare indefinite quantifiers to measure nouns:

> Many of the indefinite quantifiers derive from measure nouns; for example *lot, amount,* and the larger numbers such as *hundred* and *thousand*. Since these still require partitive Qualifiers (*a lot of...*), they are not very clearly distinguished from the general class of measure noun, which includes quantitatives (*eg: half, piece, dozen*), partitives (*eg: part, side, end*) and collectives (*eg: group, set, pack*). For the purposes of cohesion, these also can be regarded as requiring to be 'filled out' by a partitive Qualifier, and therefore as elliptical if functioning as Head. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 162)

It is possible to combine numeratives, however, it mostly occurs as a combination of ordinal and cardinal numerals, less as a combination of cardinal and indefinite quantifier. In ellipsis, numerals act similarly as non-specific deictics, as they tend to be filled out by a partitive qualifier with third person pronoun. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 162)

An exophoric reference may be also encountered with numeratives used elliptically, which can be illustrated using Halliday and Hassan's example:

[Ex.16] *My three <children> are absolute terrors.*

The word *three* in this example takes a function of a head, and it requires a person with specific information to understand this reference. This results in situational ellipsis, which is also described by Biber, Huddleston, and Quirk.

3.5.1.5. Epithets

Epithets are very rarely encountered functioning as a head of the sentence, as this group is mostly represented by adjectives. Nevertheless, if used as a head, colour adjectives, comparatives, and superlatives are the most frequent. Halliday and Hasan suggest that this is mostly due to comparatives and superlatives working similarly to numeratives. (1995: 163) Quirk suggests that taking a function of head is restricted to comparative and absolute adjectives. (1985: 901)

The superlative is usually combined with a possessive, or *the*. However, it is important to distinguish between elliptical, and non-elliptical usage of superlatives. Halliday and Hasan use a perfect example to demonstrate this difference: (1995: 164)

[Ex.17] A. *Apples are the cheapest <fruit> in autumn.* (elliptical)

B. *Apples are cheapest in autumn.* (non-elliptical)

When using superlatives in ellipsis, we may also encounter some ambiguity if more than one nominal group is mentioned. It may be demonstrated on Halliday and Hasan's example:

[Ex.18] *They are fine actors. The clown is the finest <actor/clown> I've ever seen.*

As highlighted in the example [Ex.18], it is unclear if the speaker considers the clown to be the best actor, or the best clown he has ever seen. However, if proper noun is used as a subject, the sentence will no-longer be ambiguous.

In contrast to superlatives, comparatives use two sets of presupposition, as they must compare two things. One way to use a comparative form elliptically is to create a superlative in combination with *the* in a sense of 'the …-est of two.' This comparative form is rather frequent, however it is not a true comparative.

Adjectives which are neither superlatives, nor comparatives, are rarely used as a head elliptically. This includes even colour adjectives. Halliday and Hasan mention that if the presupposing group contains an epithet or classifier, there is a strong preference to use substitution rather than ellipsis.

3.5.2. Verbal ellipsis

3.5.2.1. Ellipsis within a verbal group

This part is concerned with ellipsis within a verbal group. When used elliptically, verbal group presupposes one or more words from a preceding verbal group. Presupposition allows to recover the specific features of a verbal group, as those features are not present in the structure after the usage of ellipsis. This features include: finiteness (finite or non-finite), polarity (positive or negative, and marked or unmarked), voice (active or passive), tense (past, present, or future). Intonation may also influence the cohesion of a text, but

as the practical part of this paper will be focused on written text, it is not necessary to analyse the intonation any further. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 167)

Any non-elliptical verbal group expresses the features mentioned above. A whole group gains the mentioned features based on the structure and words chosen for that specific structure. Therefore, it is not possible to pick out a word that carries one of the features. Halliday and Hasan provide a detailed explanation:

> Consider for example the verbal group *has been seen*, this is finite, indicative, non-modal, positive, passive, past in present. The features 'finite: indicative' are expressed by the fact that the first word *have* is in the finite form *has*; 'non-modal' by the absence of a modal element; 'positive' by the absence of a negative element; 'passive' by the word *be* in next to last place plus the fact that the verb *see* is in the passive participle form *seen*; 'past in…' by the word *have* plus the fact that the next word *be* is in the past participle form *been;* and '… in present' by the fact that the word *have* is the present tense form *has*. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 168)

On the other hand, the nature of these features can result in ambiguity, as it is possible for words to have multiple forms and features. For example *has* is always finite and present, but in contrast, *have* may be either finite present or non-finite. Moreover, the words *have*, *be*, and *do* occur both in their grammatical and lexical forms, so it is crucial to distinguish between those. To quote Halliday and Hasan: "*Although the verbal group in English is extremely regular it is also fairly complex."* (1995: 169)

With nominal group, the elliptical form usually might be noticed immediately. This is, however, not the case with verbal groups, which require to analyse the rest of a text to determine the specific features of the word present in a said verbal group. For example the forms *taking*, *has been*, and *may have* might be elliptical, or might not. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 169)

3.5.2.2. Lexical ellipsis

One way to approach when encountering verbal ellipsis is to consider that some verb forms can be recognized as elliptical. For example the verbs *may* and *may not* cannot be lexical verbs and do not have any other function, so it can be said that those verbs must be elliptical if their verbal group does not contain any lexical verb. Therefore, any verbal group with missing lexical verb is elliptical, thus the term lexical ellipsis. Halliday

and Hasan also state that none of the modal operators *can, could, will, would, shall, should, may, might, must, ought to,* and *is* can function as a lexical verb. (1995: 170) As a result, any verbal group consisting of only modal operator is elliptical.

To distinct the ellipsis in the verbs *be* and *have*, it must be noted that these verbs always require a complement. With all other verbs a general rule which suggests that if a complement is omitted, the lexical verb must be also omitted or substituted. However, this does not apply to verbs *be* and *have*, as they might be a part of the ellipsis of a complement. As a result, if the complement is missing after *be* or *have*, it is certain that either verbal or clausal ellipsis is present. It is necessary to refer to a presupposed clause to specify which ellipsis is present. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 172) The lexical forms of *be* and *have* create their negatives in a similar way as verbal operators. Halliday and Hasan suggest that two distinct meanings of *have* need to be distinguished, as the one with a meaning 'to possess' can be expanded into *have got*, and its negative is *hasn't*. The other one with a meaning 'take' cannot be expanded and forms its negative like other lexical verbs, through the usage of operator *do*. (1995: 172-173)

The lexical verb *do* usually requires a complement, but *do* as a substitute does not. A helpful thing to remember is that verbal operator *do* occurs only in a finite form and comes first in a verbal group, while substitute *do* is a substitute for a lexical verb, and therefore comes last. Nevertheless, there might be still ambiguity with verbal groups which consist of only one word. The negative forms of *do* are however pretty clear, and only the operator has negative forms. If any verbal groups consisting only of the negative forms of *do* is encountered, an ellipsis must be present. Similarly, the words *do, does,* and *did* show a presence of ellipsis when used before the subject of interrogative clauses. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 172)

It is also possible to encounter a group where a lexical item is elipted, and the word *to* is present on a final position in the verbal group. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 172)

In lexical ellipsis, an omitted element is always a lexical verb, but it is possible to omit more words in a verbal group. Generally, it can be said that the ellipsis is done from right to left, while the last element, the lexical verb, has to be omitted, and the first element cannot be omitted. When these criteria are satisfied, the user of ellipsis can decide to omit

the remaining words in the verbal group. Halliday and Hasan note that even though it is possible to omit more, the preferred style is to omit only a lexical verb plus the elements which can be presupposed from the context. (1995: 174)

3.5.2.3. Operator ellipsis

There is another form of ellipsis where the lexical verb remains intact, but the operator is ellipted. Thus, this form is called 'operator ellipsis.' If operator ellipsis is used it also involves the ellipsis of subject, which must be presupposed from elsewhere. When operator ellipsis occurs between sentences, it is mostly in question-answer sequences. The reason for this is that in most cases everything, with the exception of lexical verb, is presupposed. In several occasions the active or passive voice is repudiated, and if the resulting elliptical group is passive, *be* must precede the lexical verb to support its passive from. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 175)

Halliday and Hasan mention that while the operator ellipsis is fairly easy to recognize, two uncertainties may be encountered and must be identified through the reference to the surrounding text. (1995: 175) The first problem is that most verbs have the same form of past tense and the past or passive participle. Non-finite and non-elliptical verbal group and finite verbal group with ellipted operator being identical is the second problem. However, the recognition is made easier due to the fact that the perfective form of the non-finite group mostly has *to* at the beginning. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 175)

3.5.2.4. The consequences of verbal ellipsis

Verbal ellipsis often significantly alters the clause, as it often includes the ellipsis of other related elements which are in the same part of the clause. Moreover, when verbal ellipsis is used, any structurally related non-contrastive elements must be omitted. Another thing to mention is that if an operator ellipsis is used for an indicative clause and even the subject is ellipted, the ellipted clause remains indicative even without subject. Similarly, if the elliptical group alters any features of omitted complement or adjunct, which are in the presupposed clause, the alteration must be expressed within the elliptical group in order to repudiate the presupposed features. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 195)

3.5.3. Clausal ellipsis

3.5.3.1. Ellipsis in reported speech

One of the frequently ellipted elements are the second clauses of reported speech, which include reported indirect statements, yes/no questions, and WH-questions.

When an ellipsis is applied to indirect WH-questions, it is important to note that presupposition is not targeted on a preceding clause, but rather a preceding sentence, as reported clause can reach out beyond its own sentence for a reference. Moreover, the presupposed clause carries over its features and elements. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 218)

Reported yes/no questions mostly result in its elliptical form being zero. In other words, every element of the preceding clause is ellipted, but the features of the presupposed clause are carried over. Also, the elliptical reported clause might be interpreted as a question independently on the presupposed clause, if the verb in the reporting clause introduces a question. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 219)

An ambiguity may exist between indirect statements and indirect questions if the reporting clause is omitted and the reporting verb can introduce either. Such verbs are *tell, say, report, know,* etc. Halliday and Hasan note that the reported clause with *say* nearly always presupposes a question. Also, there is a tendency to interpret a 'zero' reported clause as a question if the reporting clause is negative. (Halliday and Hasan 1995: 221)

Quirk mentions a case where we can use ellipsis on a whole clause, including introductory words. This is however limited mostly to dependent *to*-infinitive clauses. However, the ellipted clauses must act as a complementation of other clauses. This type of ellipsis is considered 'weak' by Quirk, as a precise recovery cannot be easily achieved.

4. Introduction to the analytical part

This part will be analytical and its aim is to examine the occurrences of ellipsis in twitter messages, which are expected to have a large amount of elliptical constructions within them.

4.1. Corpus description

The corpus will consist of 140 tweets of the people working in the e-sports branch. This corpus contains 142 instances of ellipsis. This includes professional players, lawyers, commentators, casters, and retired professionals. The messages were posted by native, or non-native speakers. Native speakers form one group, and it includes mostly casters, as their tweets have a purpose of informing the audience about the upcoming events, etc. Therefore, their tweets usually contain little to no mistakes. The non-native speakers form the second group. This group consists of one caster, three active players, one team owner, and one retired professional. If we consider the language of the non-native speakers, it is more likely to encounter mistakes while analysing their tweets. However, these people usually communicate in English daily, so there is a reason to include them. Also, it was in consideration to add more tweets by Asians, especially Koreans, but their English tweets are barely readable, so the idea was revoked.

4.2. Methodology

The aim of this paper is to determine the frequency of ellipsis in twitter messages. The twitter messages are called 'tweets.' It is important to note that each tweet has a limit of 140 characters, and therefore it is quite likely that ellipsis will be one of the devices used for the economisation of a text.

The text is labelled according to the origins of the English speaker. There are 7 different authors using native English, and 7 different authors using non-native English. Each author is marked using an alphabetical order. Therefore, the authors are marked A-G. The non-native speakers are marked using the same method, however, to distinct them from the native speakers a non-capital N is used before their alphabetical letter. Therefore, the result are non-native speakers marked nA-nG. The corpus contains 10 tweets

per author, resulting in 140 tweets in total. The tweets are analysed for the occurrence of ellipsis and each type of ellipsis is marked.

Formal type of ellipsis will be marked with regards to the type of reference. Therefore, it will be stated if the recoverability is anaphoric, cataphoric, situational, or structural. It will be also noted which clausal element was ellipted, and at which position the ellipsis occurred. This might be demonstrated using the following example. <*I am*>(s+o, sit, ini) *so excited to watch Sneaky's stream tonight !!* The example shows clearly, that it is firstly considered which element has been ellipted. The second analysed factor is a type of recoverability. Finally, the last analysed factor is the position of the ellipsis.

5. Analytical part

The goal of this part is to analyse the occurrences of ellipsis in the chosen corpus. Each occurrence of ellipsis will be carefully analysed in order to understand its specific function when used in twitter messages. It is expected that the general rules of ellipsis apply to ellipsis in twitter messages only partially, as the messages are usually very short. The goal of this part is also to find possible differences between native and non-native speakers regarding the usage of ellipsis. Therefore, the frequency of each ellipted element will be analysed separately for native and non-native occurrences. After that, the total amount of occurrences will be analysed to determine the specific features of ellipsis in twitter messages.

5.1. Analysis of the ellipted sentence elements

The following table shows the frequency of ellipsis in the selected corpus. The table does not show how many tweets contained the given type of ellipsis. The most frequent ellipsis was an ellipsis of subject + operator. This element will be analysed in the next subchapter. Finally, it should be noted that ellipsis occurred 77 times in the tweets of native speakers of English, and 65 times in the tweets of non-native speakers. Therefore, it totals 142 cases of ellipsis in 140 tweets. In general, it can be said that an average tweet contains 1 case of ellipsis. Given the limited length of the twitter messages, it is still a considerable amount.

Table 2

Element/Number of occurrences	Native	%Native	Non-native	%Non-native	Total
Subject + operator	30	39,0	32	49,2	62
Determiner	12	15,6	11	16,9	23
Subject	11	14,3	7	10,8	18
Conjunction	8	10,4	3	4,6	11
Preposition	3	3,9	2	3,1	5
Subject + verb	4	5,2	1	1,5	5
Verb	2	2,6	1	1,5	3

Clausal	0	0,0	3	4,6	3
Infinitive marker	1	1,3	2	3,1	3
Object	2	2,6	1	1,5	3
Verb phrase	1	1,3	1	1,5	2
Object + adverbial	1	1,3	0	0,0	1
Object complement	0	0,0	1	1,5	1
Subject + operator + verb	1	1,3	0	0,0	1
Operator	1	1,3	0	0,0	1

5.1.1. Ellipsis of subject + operator

The ellipsis of subject + operator is the most frequent type of ellipsis on twitter. It occurred in 39% cases of ellipsis used by native speakers of English. It was even more appealing to the non-native speakers of English, as it seems to be their favourite type of ellipsis which they used in almost 50% of cases, occurring in 32 instances. This type of ellipsis occurs mainly in the initial position, where the subject is usually located. It is no wonder that the subject is ellipted so frequently in twitter messages, as there is usually no need for a user to introduce himself, as any tweet contains a user name of the person who posted it. The following example may give a suitable image of how a common tweet looks like:

[Ex.19] MonteCristo @MonteCristo

<I am> Streaming for three hours.

As the example shows, it is unnecessary for a twitter user to begin a short message by using himself as a subject because the author is already mentioned in the head of the tweet. However, this may result in ambiguity when not used carefully. As an example we may use a tweet nB1:

nB1: <I am / We are> Playing TSM today.

The author of the tweet [nB1] is a member a certain e-sports team, and wanted to inform his fans about the upcoming match. We may use this specific knowledge to presuppose

that the ellipted item is a 1nd person pronoun in plural + an auxiliary. However, this might not be clear to a person without the specific knowledge, so the recoverability is definitely situational in this case. However, Quirk might argue that this is not a proper ellipsis, as we may fill out the missing words in several ways.

Another ambiguity is apparent in the tweet E1:

E1 - <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) Doing an AMA on LoL subreddit with @GreatestLeagueT cohosts @scarra & @XellTweets. <You may> (S+o, sit, ini) Ask any non GLTS questions too.

The last sentence emits a conflict between the ellipsis and imperative. The said sentence can be interpreted either as an imperative, or as a permission of the organiser of AMA (meaning ask me anything). Therefore, if we consider this sentence to be elliptical, it meets the criteria of precise recoverability mentioned by Quirk (1985: 884). As it does not meet the criteria of textual recoverability, it can be labelled as situational ellipsis. However, if the sentence is interpreted as imperative, the construction becomes non-elliptical and no further analysis is needed. There is, however, no hint to consider either variant to be more likely.

As mentioned in preceding paragraphs, this type of ellipsis occurs mostly in combination with situational recoverability. Nevertheless, it is also possible to encounter a structural variant of this ellipsis. This can be illustrated using tweet G4:

G4: Fear not, I always keep a spare. I'm back on the stream w/ audio. <It is> (s+o, str, ini) Time to order a new Sennheiser though.

The structure of the sentence allows to presuppose which element has been omitted, as there is no other logical option to fill out the ellipted part. However, this is not very frequent, as the structural ellipsis occurred in combination with the ellipsis of subject and operator only in 8 of 62 total cases.

In regards to native and non-native speakers of English it can be said that non-native speakers adopted the ellipsis of subject and operator very smoothly, and are using it in many occasions, even to a greater degree than native speakers who tend to use non-elliptical sentences when communicating information of higher importance.

Also, it should be noted that the usage of this ellipsis varies from author to author and some authors tend to avoid using it.

5.1.2. Ellipsis of determiner

The ellipsis of determiner is a very common tool to use when attempting to economise the text. As Quirk mentions, this ellipsis is frequently used in written styles called 'headlinese' and 'telegraphese.' (Quirk 1985: 900) Perhaps, twitter may be considered to resemble a style of 'telegraphese,' as its users often communicate information using the least amount of words possible. As a result, determiners in twitter messages are commonly omitted not just at the beginning of a sentence, but often also in the middle of a sentence. This type of ellipsis is also unlikely to cause any misunderstanding or ambiguity, as it carries a very low amount of information.

When considering the recoverability of ellipted determiners, Quirk seems to be unsure whether to link this ellipsis with situational or structural recoverability. In fact, he also mentions the possibility of ellipting a determiner in both of the respective chapters. However, in his chapter dealing with situational ellipsis, he mentions only the articles at the beginning of a sentence (Quirk 1985: 899). Nevertheless, it can be said that it is commonly pretty clear which element has been ellipted, which favours the variant of structural recoverability.

To compare the usage of this type by native and non-native speakers, the native speakers used it in 15.6% of occasions, while the non-native speakers used it in 16.9% occasions. In round numbers it is 12 to 11 instances, which is a reasonably balanced number. However, it might be argued that some of these instances are not ellipsis, but mistakes which might be a reasonable argument, especially considering the non-native speakers. This, however, cannot be found out without asking the authors of the tweets directly.

5.1.3. Ellipsis of subject alone

The third most frequent ellipsis in the corpus is the ellipsis of subject. For this type of ellipsis, similar rules apply as with the ellipsis of subject and operator. The ellipsis of subject occurs mostly in initial position at the beginning of the sentence. This can be explained by the nature of tweets, as twitter users tend to omit the personal pronoun

at the beginning of the tweet due to their name being mentioned in the head of the tweet. Additionally, a same ambiguity can be occurred as with the ellipsis of subject and operator. This can be seen in the tweet nF5:

nF5: <It was> (s+o, sit, ini) A much better week for us, <I/we> (S, sit, ini) still have stuff to work on but <I am/ we are> (s+o, sit, ini) happy with the results!

In tweet nF5 it is not clear if the ellipsis references just to the author, or his team as well. Both variants are possible, but that violates Quirk's rule of precise recoverability. An argument might be that the preceding sentence mentions a group of people rather than only the author, so this should be a sufficient reference to consider this case at least a standard ellipsis. However, the next sentence is ambiguous in a same way, and since it communicates the mood and emotions of the author, and since we generally cannot speak for others when expressing mood and emotions, there is a strong implication that the author speaks only for himself in the last sentence. This, however, only adds to the ambiguity of the subject ellipsis. Therefore, when using this type of ellipsis, a careful approach is advised to avoid such ambiguities.

Quirk considers this ellipsis to be situational (Quirk 1985: 896-899). However, in case of twitter it might be argued that the reference of this is, in fact, anaphoric. To explain this a following example might be used:

[Ex.20] Meteos @C9Meteos

<I> Won't be streaming today.

Now, it is clear that a possible reader knows who is posting this tweet. If the author of the tweet was informing about someone else than himself, it would be stated explicitly. When any other meaning is not stated explicitly, it should be automatically presupposed that the ellipted element references to the author himself. Consequently, when forwarding the information to others using the reported speech, the reporting sentence would look like this: "*Meteos tweeted that he won't be streaming today.*" This might be an argument to consider that this ellipsis can have anaphoric recoverability when used on twitter.

This type of ellipsis is clearly less popular amongst both native and non-native speakers of English, as native speakers used it only 11 times making it 14.3% of cases, and non-native speakers using it only 7 times, therefore in 10,8% of instances. The reason for this might be that the usage of subject and operator ellipsis offers a larger variety of options when used in twitter messages. Nevertheless, it is still one of the most frequent ellipses on twitter.

5.1.4. Ellipsis of conjunction

The majority of ellipted conjunctions in this corpus consist of the word *that*, which may be optionally ellipted with little to no side effect. Therefore, it is unlikely that the ellipsis of *that* results in ambiguity. The ambiguity may occur only if the elliptical structure could be also filled out by words other than *that*, for example *which or who* in which case the structure would not meet the criterion of precise recoverability, and could not be considered to be a valid example of ellipsis.

Only one different instance of this ellipsis includes the word *if*. It was used in one of the few coordinated sentences in this corpus, is recoverable anaphorically from the preceding clause, and occurs in the initial position of another clause. Once more, the usage of this type of ellipsis is unlikely to cause any ambiguity.

Finally, a difference between the usage of ellipsis by native and non-native speakers is apparent here, as it was used in 8 cases by native, and in 3 cases by non-native speakers. Percentage-wise, this can be expressed as 10.4% for native, and 4.6% for non-native. It might be argued that non-native speakers tend to avoid ellipting the word *that* which results in less instances of ellipsis of this word by non-native speakers. However, after counting the non-elliptical occurrences of the word *that* in the corpus, it can be concluded that there is a strong preference for native speakers to use the sentences containing *that*, which they ellipt, as the number of non-elliptical occurrences of *that* is 5 for native and 5 for non-native speakers. Therefore, we can see a stronger preference to use the word *that*, for which there is no reasonable explanation.

5.1.5. Ellipsis of preposition

The ellipsis of preposition was not very frequent, as it occurred only 5 times throughout the whole corpus, and in regards to the usage by native and non-native speakers it is fairly balanced with 3 instances in tweets of native and 2 instances in tweets of non-native speakers. However, it can be said that at least the used prepositions vary, so the ellipsis of the words *with*, *at*, *on,* and *in* is present in the corpus. Therefore, even though there are not many occurrences a variety of different prepositions was ellipted, as only *with* occurred two times.

The recoverability of this ellipsis is mostly anaphoric, as in the tweet B10:

B10: <We are> (s+o, sit, ini) Filming our first video episode of #TheDiveLoL later today with @RiotKobe and <with> (prep, ana, ini) @RiotAzael < Are there>(s+o, str, ini) Any twitter questions for the end of the episode?

The author informs about filming of the first episode of a talk show, and mentions his co-hosts. As the preposition *with* is already used in reference to the first co-host, it is not necessary to repeat it when mentioning the second co-host. Therefore, it is a clear example of anaphoric reference. The ellipsis of preposition in combination with anaphoric recoverability occurred 3 times in the corpus, with the remaining 2 instances having structural recoverability.

Structural recoverability is also possible to encounter in combination with the ellipsis of preposition. However, in this case only our general knowledge of English allows us to determine that an element is missing.

5.1.6. Ellipsis of Subject + Verb

Another type of ellipsis which shows a slight difference in the usage by native and non-native speakers is the ellipsis of subject and verb together. This apparently occurs only in coordinated sentences where we can recover both subject and verb from the preceding clause. Therefore, the recoverability was always anaphoric. The omitted words were also always ellipted from the initial position of the clause, so it can be said that this type of ellipsis has clear boundaries when used in twitter messages.

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, there is a slight difference regarding the usage, as the native speakers used this ellipsis 4 times, while the non-native speakers used it only once. Percentage-wise the difference is 3.7%, slightly favouring the native speakers. This is an expected result, as it was estimated that the non-native speakers will avoid using ellipsis in certain cases in order to not make unnecessary mistakes.

5.1.7. Ellipsis of Verb

The verb alone was ellipted only in 3 cases, which is not surprising. The examples used by Halliday and Hasan indicated that this type of ellipsis is used mostly in question-answer sequences or question tags, which are not very frequent on twitter. However, twitter users rarely waste a chance to ellipt the elements, if those are carrying little to no information. The instances of verbal ellipsis in this corpus are subject mostly to structural recoverability. Therefore, the recoverability can be achieved through the knowledge that the verb is missing in the sentence, but it should not be.

As the ellipsis of verb occurred only in 3 cases, it is not possible to determine any trends amongst native and non-native English speakers.

5.1.8. Clausal ellipsis

The ellipsis of a clause is not very frequent on twitter. It occurred in 3 cases, and only in tweets of non-native English speakers. It was always used in a coordinated sentence for the purpose of avoiding repetition. The non-elliptical variant would consist of two almost identical sentences, which would not be appealing to a reader. Therefore, the second instance of the said clause is ellipted. This ellipsis always occurred with anaphoric recoverability. This is quite common, as the length of the clauses would make it impossible to be recovered by other means than textual recoverability. Therefore, it can be said that it is restricted to anaphoric and cataphoric recoverability.

Clausal ellipsis in this corpus always appeared in initial position, but with the usage of fronting, it might also occur in final position, which can be demonstrated using the tweet nA2:

nA2: If you are playing Jihn lategame, sell the swifties and <If you are playing Jihn lategame> buy attack speed boots. Trust me.

The whole ellipted clause could be also inserted at the end of the sentence, following the word *boots*, as it would not make the sentence ungrammatical. Moreover, this sentence also emits a different conflict. The purpose of this tweet is to give a technical advice to authors' fans. In this case, the tweet is considered to give two tips which are connected using coordination. However, it is also possible that it gives one tip, with the word *and* functioning as a sequence adverbial *and then*, where only the word *then* is ellipted. This would result in structural recoverability, rather than anaphoric. Moreover, there is no implication to consider either option more likely.

Finally, it is not clear why native speakers do not use this type of ellipsis, however, it might be explained by the fact that the tweets of native speakers show a higher percentage of ellipsis of shorter elements. Therefore, according to the table 2, it is possible that native speakers opt to ellipt single clause elements instead of clause as a whole.

5.1.9. Infinitive marker ellipsis

It was surprising to find out that the ellipsis of an infinitive marker also occurs in twitter messages. Even though, this ellipsis was not covered in the theoretical part, it is quite clear when it occurs, as it is always referenced to using anaphoric recoverability. To illustrate this, the tweet G7:

G7: How to enjoy the Telecom War and not <to> (inf, ana, ini) be a biased caster #LCK

In the tweet G7, the infinitive marker already appeared in the first clause, and therefore it is not necessary to repeat it in the next one. However, it might be argued that it is possible that the omission could be filled out using additional words, for example the word *how*. Therefore, the resulting clause would be "*How not to be a biased caster*." However, it is likely that the meaning of the tweet is to question the possibility of enjoying something and not being biased at the same time, which is a similar issue to the one covered in 6.1.8.

The ellipsis of an infinite marker occurred twice in non-native and once in native tweets. Given the really small example, the tendencies of native and non-native speakers cannot be compared.

5.1.10. Ellipsis of object

The last type of ellipsis deserving its own chapter is the ellipsis of object. It appeared in 3 instances, being used twice by native speakers and once by non-native speakers. It occurred either in initial position with anaphoric recoverability or in final position with cataphoric recoverability. All three instances were present in coordinated sentences, and the object was presupposed either from the preceding or the following clause.

As with the several previous ellipses, due to the small amount of occurrences it is not possible to find any clue of the usage by native and non-native speakers.

5.1.11. Marginal instances of ellipsis

This subchapter aims to mention the remaining ellipses which occurred in the corpus. However, each type of ellipsis mentioned in this chapter occurred only 2 times or less, and it is, therefore, not possible to find any linkage between its usage and the origins of its author.

The ellipsis of verb phrase occurred two times in total, and in combination with anaphoric recoverability. As stated in 6.1.8. it is very unlikely for verb phrase ellipsis to be combined with situational or structural recoverability, as longer elements are generally more difficult to recover precisely. The verb phrase ellipsis appeared both in initial and final position.

The corpus also contains one instance of ellipsis of object and adverbial. This is used in combination with cataphoric recoverability and in final position. Although used by a native speaker, it is expected that non-native speakers would be able to use this ellipsis in a similar way.

An ellipsis of subject and operator combined with the ellipsis of a verb also occurred in this corpus. However, it can be argued that the omitted elements cannot be recovered precisely and that the elliptical group may look completely different. Therefore, due to its recoverability issues, it can be classified only as ‘weak ellipsis,’ which is a term used by Quirk for the cases of ellipsis with multiple choices to fill out the ellipted group.

Another instance of ellipsis includes the ellipsis of object complement, which is done with cataphoric reference, and the elliptical group is in a final position. It was used by a non-native speaker.

The last occurrence of ellipsis was an ellipsis of *are* used as operator. This is quite common and it was also mentioned by Halliday. However, Halliday seems to consider only textual recoverability in this ellipsis. (1995: 174) The operator ellipsis in tweet D2 is, however, recoverable only through the knowledge of the sentence structure.

5.2. Recoverability

Table 3

	Native	%Native	Non-native	%Non-native	Total
Situational	25	32,5	29	44,6	54
Structural	30	39,0	20	30,8	50
Anaphoric	19	24,7	14	21,5	33
Cataphoric	3	3,9	2	3,1	5

The most frequent recoverability type of ellipsis in twitter messages is definitely the situational recoverability, which is favoured by non-native speakers, who used it in 44.6% of cases. Native speakers, with their 32.5%, tend to use it less frequently than structural ellipsis, which is not the case for non-native speakers. However, it is not clear whether to consider the ellipsis of 1st person pronoun to have a situational or anaphoric recoverability due to the nature of twitter messages, which is Analysed in detail in 6.1.3.

Another very common recoverability on twitter is the structural recoverability. This is because twitter users tend to omit the elements which are carrying little information which helps to abide the character limit of tweets. Native speakers tend to favour this recoverability with their 30 instances, making a 39% of the ellipses structurally recoverable. On the other hand, non-native speakers used it only 20 times, which means in 30.8% of ellipses.

Anaphoric recoverability, although usually being the most frequent recoverability type, is present in 24.7% ellipses of native and 21.5% of ellipses of non-native speakers.

It can be said that this is also the case due to the nature of twitter, as twitter users generally avoid coordinated sentences, where anaphoric and cataphoric recoverability mostly occur.

Finally, cataphoric recoverability was the least frequent recoverability in this corpus. As this recoverability is not used very frequently even outside of twitter messages, it is no wonder that this recoverability was present only 5 times in total in this corpus. The reason is the same as with anaphoric recoverability.

5.3. Position of ellipsis

Table 4

	Native	%Native	Non-native	%Non-native	Total
Initial	65	84,4	60	92,9	130
Medial	8	10,4	3	4,3	11
Final	4	5,2	2	2,9	6

The table 4 indicates a surprising result. The most dominant position of ellipsis in twitter messages is the initial position. Of all 142 instances of ellipsis in occurred in 92.9% ellipses used by non-native speakers and 84.4% of ellipses used by native speakers. This is a huge number, but it can be explained. Similarly as with anaphoric and cataphoric ellipsis, the nature of twitter favours short messages which usually do not contain any coordinated clauses. This results in much more instances of subject ellipsis, in comparison to the instances of ellipsis of object or modifiers.

As for medial ellipsis, it occurs only in a form of *that* ellipted in the middle of the sentence, and is used mostly by native speakers of English, so it makes a 10.4% of all ellipses encountered in this corpus.

Final ellipsis occurs only 6 times throughout the corpus, and 5 of those instances are in coordinated clauses with the elliptical group being recoverable from nearby clauses.

6. Summary of results

The analysis shows that a typical ellipsis in twitter is found in initial position, the ellipted element is mostly a subject in combination with an operator. This type of ellipsis is generally not textually recoverable. However, due to the nature of twitter, which puts the name of the author to the headline of each tweet, it is arguable that these are in fact cases of anaphoric reference. Through the combination of these arguments we can determine the most frequent ellipsis in twitter messages – an ellipsis of subject and operator at the beginning of a tweet. This ellipsis is mostly found in the tweets of non-native speakers of English, who ellipted the subject and operator in 49.2% cases of ellipsis. However, native speakers were not very far from them with their 39%.

The second most ellipted element are determiners. The ellipsis of determiners occurs not only at the beginning of the sentence, but also in the middle of a sentence. Therefore, it can be said that the style of twitter users is very similar to the 'headlinese' style, which favours very brief messages, and all elements which are carrying little information are ellipted, which, in the case of twitter, are determiners. The ellipsis of determiners is fairly balanced amongst both native and non-native speakers, as native speakers used it in 15.6% of cases, and non-native speakers in 16.9% of cases.

An ellipsis of subject is also fairly common on twitter, and the third most used ellipsis. The numbers are slightly in favour of native speakers, who used it in 14.3% cases, while non-native speakers only in 10.8% of cases. This ellipsis is similar to the ellipsis of subject and operator, which, however, cannot cover the negative operators. In that case, it is possible to ellipt just the subject alone and begin the sentence with an auxiliary. Nevertheless, this is just an example, and the ellipsis of subject occurs commonly even when the auxiliary is positive.

A conjunction is the fourth most frequently ellipted element. This type of ellipsis is favoured by native speakers of English who use it in 10.4% of cases, while non-native speakers use it only in 4.6% of cases. The ellipsis of conjunction on twitter mostly involves the omission of the word *that*.

Another ellipsis that is worth mentioning is the ellipsis of preposition, which occur in 3-4% of cases, regardless of author's mother language. On the other hand, the ellipsis of both subject and verb is used in 5.2% of cases by native speakers, and in 1.5% of cases by non-native speakers of English.

Finally, ellipsis did not occur at all in 22 out of 70 tweets by native speakers of English, while for non-native speakers it was in 31 out of 70 tweets. The total number of ellipses was 77 for native and 65 for non-native speakers of English. Considering these statistics, it can be assumed that some non-native speakers avoid using ellipsis, while some are using it very frequently. Moreover, the lesser percentage of subject and operator ellipsis, and higher percentage of other types of ellipsis in tweets of native speakers only show that native English speakers use a wider variety of ellipses, whilst non-native speakers mostly stick to the ellipsis of subject and operator, determiner, and subject.

7. Conclusion

This chapter covers the results of the analysis which was focused on the usage of ellipsis in twitter messages by native and non-native speakers of English. The corpus consisted of 70 tweets of native and 70 tweets of non-native speakers of English. The authors of tweets are people working in the branch of e-sports as active professional players, coaches, casters, and team owners. Therefore, even the non-native speakers use English on a daily basis which implies that they should know to use English very well.

The analytical part proved that the most frequent clause element to be ellipted is a subject in combination with an operator. To compare the usage of this ellipsis by native and non-native speakers of English, a table containing the percentages of the usage by the respective groups was created. The results show that the ellipsis of subject and operator is mostly used by non-native speakers, who used it in 49.2% of cases. The non-native speakers used the said ellipsis only in 39% of cases, which is a huge difference. The other two groups where non-native speakers show a higher percentage of use are the ellipses of clause and infinite marker. The ellipses of object complement and verb phrase are not considered, as those occurred only in few instances, which is not enough to find any significant difference between the styles of native and non-native speakers of English.

Given the results, it should be noted that although native speakers of English do not use the ellipsis of subject and operator as frequently as their non-native counterparts, they tend to use a much wider variety of ellipses. Slight difference can be found in the ellipsis of subject, which is used a 3.5% more often by native speakers. Another difference is in the ellipsis of conjunction, this time with 5.8% difference. The last ellipsis to show a notable difference is the ellipsis of subject and verb, where the difference is 3.7%. The ellipsis of other elements is spread rather evenly among both groups.

The tendencies of both groups can be also noted in the preference to use certain type of recoverability. Native speakers tend to use the structural recoverability more, as they used it 30 times, which makes 39% of cases of ellipsis by native speakers structurally recoverable. Therefore, it should be noted that native speakers often rely on their

knowledge of the sentence structure to recover the ellipted elements. On the other hand, non-native speakers tend to favour situational recoverability, which they used 29 times, in 44.6% of cases. There is no notable difference in the usage of anaphoric and cataphoric recoverability, as both groups tend to use it with a similar frequency.

Considering the position of ellipsis, the initial position of ellipsis is favoured by both groups. However, non-native speakers used it in 92.3% of cases, while native speakers only in 84.4% of cases. These large numbers can be explained by the nature of twitter, which favours the usage of short messages, which are, therefore, very unlikely to contain coordinated sentences. As a result, the most ellipsis in twitter messages is the ellipsis of subject and operator, which occurs mostly in initial position at the beginning of a tweet. Therefore, it is clear why the ellipsis in initial position is so frequent on twitter. As for medial ellipsis, native speakers tend to use it more often than non-native speakers, which is notable in the difference of 5.8%.

Another result of the analysis was that ellipsis in twitter messages is notably different from ellipsis in longer texts. It is mentioned in the theoretical part that the anaphoric recoverability and final position are the most frequent. However, twitter messages contain mostly ellipses with situational and structural recoverability and initial position. Once again, this can be explained by the limited length of the twitter messages.

The analysis shows that there definitely are slight differences in the usage of ellipsis by native and non-native speakers of English. Native speakers tend to use a wider variety of ellipses and recoverability. Non-native speakers, on the other hand, tend to favour the ellipsis of 3-5 clausal elements and tend to avoid the ellipsis of the rest. Finally, non-native speakers tend to produce more tweets with the absence of ellipsis, as 31 of their tweets contained no ellipsis, while this was the case only in 22 tweets by native speakers.

8. Resumé

Cílem práce je analyzovat výskyt elipsy v twitterových zprávách rodilých i nerodilých mluvčí angličtiny a následně je porovnat za účelem nalezení rozdílů ve stylu užití elipsy.

Práce je rozdělena na teoretickou a praktickou část. Účelem teoretické části je studium elipsy za pomoci odborné literatury. Účelem praktické části je analýza korpusu za účelem identifikace výskytů elipsy v tweetech rodilých i nerodilých mluvčí angličtiny.

Práce začíná představením termínu *redukce*, který je klíčový pro účel této práce. Pod tento termín totiž spadá i samotná elipsa, která je jednou z forem redukce textu za účelem ekonomizace. Za pomoci příkladů jsou představeny také další typy redukce textu, což může pomoci jednotlivé typy od sebe rozeznat.

Další kapitola představuje termín *návratnost*, který je pro elipsu naprosto nepostradatelný, což je dokázáno i tím, že o návratnosti pojednává více autorů. Přestože se zmínění autoři liší v terminologii, praktický přínos pro elipsu se tím nemění.

Následuje nesmírně obsáhlá kapitola o elipse, která začíná obecným pojednáním o přístupu různých autorů k tématu. Je například zmíněno, že Halliday a Hasan se zaměřují spíše na identifikaci větných členů, které byly vynechány, zatímco Quirk se soustředí spíše na okolí elipsy s poukázáním na návratnost. Snaží se tedy zjistit, odkud je možné vynechané větné členy dosadit zpět do věty. Další kapitola porovnává elipsu se substitucí. Děje se tak zejména z toho důvodu, že oba jevy jsou úzce spjaty a v některých případech mohou být dokonce zaměnitelné. Halliday a Hasan také definují elipsu jako *nulovou substituci*. Substitucí se rozumí záměna jednoho slova za druhé, což implikuje, že nulová substituce v zásadě znamená záměnu jednoho slova za nic a na místě původního slova tak vzniká prázdné místo.

Následující kapitola definuje kritéria elipsy, která jsou nezbytná pro určení typů elipsy. Prvním kritériem je návratnost vynechaných slov. Toto kritérium říká, že vynechaná slova musí být návratná. Jednoduše řečeno, musí být zcela jasné, jaká slova byla vlastně vynechána. Toto je základní kritérium elipsy. Druhým kritériem je vznik gramaticky defektní konstrukce při aplikaci elipsy. V případě užití elipsy musí být tedy výsledná věta

gramaticky defektní, díky čemuž poznáme, že věta obsahuje elipsu. Třetí kritérium říká, že pokud jsou vynechaná slova vložena zpět do věty, výsledná věta bude gramaticky správná a její význam se nezmění. Čtvrté a páté kritérium je prezentováno kolektivně, protože při nesplnění čtvrtého kritéria není možné splnit kritérium páté. Čtvrté kritérium tedy říká, že chybějící slova jsou textuálně návratná, na což navazuje páté kritérium, říkající, že vynechaná slova jsou v textu přítomna ve stejném tvaru.

Za pomoci kritérií uvedených v kapitole 3.2. můžeme určit několik typů elipsy. Prvním typem je elipsa striktní, jež splňuje všechna uvedená kritéria. Druhým typem je elipsa standardní, která nesplňuje pouze kritérium páté, tj. návratnost slov ve stejném tvaru. Pokud elipsa splňuje první a čtvrté kritérium, jedná se o kvazi-elipsu. Tento typ elipsy je však i samotným autorem termínu označován za formu substituce a tak na něj v analýze není brán zřetel. Dalším typem elipsy je elipsa situační, která se vyznačuje tím, že návratnost není možná z přilehlého textu, ale spíše na základě znalosti jistých vnějších skutečností. Podobně je na tom strukturální elipsa, která lze naopak odvodit za pomoci znalosti větné struktury. Posledním typem elipsy je elipsa slabá, která zahrnuje případy, kdy je více možností, jak vyplnit prázdné místo, které díky elipse nastane.

Další podkapitola je zaměřena na klasifikaci elipsy podle tří vlastností. První z nich je návratnost, jež může být anaforická, kataforická, strukturální a situační. Situační elipsa je následně rozvedena podrobněji. Další vlastnost je funkční typ, jež říká, že některé elipsy se určují snadněji, na základě toho v jaké větě se daná elipsa nachází. Poslední vlastností je formální typ, který se zabývá pozicí elipsy ve větě. Tato pozice může být počáteční, střední a konečná.

Poslední z větších podkapitol se zabývá elipsou jednotlivých větných členů. Jednotlivé větné členy jsou zde podrobně popsány a je také zmíněno v jaké formě se mohou v elipse nacházet. Konkrétně se jedná o nominální elipsu, slovesnou elipsu a větnou elipsu.

Následující kapitolou je již úvod do analytické části. V tomto úvodu jsou uvedeny informace o korpusu, a zvolený postup pro vypracování analýzy. Úvod do analytické části také v krátkosti pojednává o charakteristických vlastnostech twitterových zpráv, které mají stanovenu maximální délku 140 znaků. Také je zmíněno, že twitterovým zprávám se říká *tweety*. Následuje informace o tom, že korpus tvoří 70 tweetů rodilých mluvčí a 70

tweetů nerodilých mluvčí angličtiny. Ke zvolené metodě analýzy je zmíněno, že bylo vybráno celkem 14 uživatelů twitteru, a od každého bylo použito vždy po 10 tweetech.

V analytické části byly jednotlivé tweety analyzovány a výsledky zpracovány do tabulek pro větší přehlednost. Podkapitoly jsou poté řazeny sestupně podle počtu výskytů. První podkapitola pojednává o elipse podmětu a operátoru, jež se vyskytla v celkem 62 případech. Jedná se o vůbec nejoblíbenější elipsu nerodilých mluvčí, kteří ji použili ve 49.2% případů. Pro upřesnění je nutno dodat, že procenta zahrnují pouze všechny elipsy dané skupiny, v tomto případě nerodilých mluvčí. Tato elipsa byla však velice populární i u rodilých mluvčí, kteří ji využili v 39% případů. Tyto výsledky naznačují, že nerodilí mluvčí používají elipsy podmětu a operátoru podstatně více, než rodilí mluvčí.

Dalším vynechávaným větným členem byly determinanty. Ty byly vynechány celkem 23krát. Procentuálně však není velký rozdíl mezi užitím elipsy determinantu rodilými a nerodilými mluvčími.

Samotný podmět byl vynecháván poměrně často, a to v osmnácti případech. Elipsa podmětu byla však oblíbenější u rodilých mluvčí, než u nerodilých mluvčí. Patrný je 3,5% rozdíl ve prospěch rodilých mluvčí.

Čtvrtým nejčastěji vynechávaným větným členem byly spojky, které byly vynechány v jedenácti případech. V elipsách rodilých mluvčí však elipsy spojek činí až 10.4% výskytů, oproti 4.6% u nerodilých mluvčí. Rozdíl je v tomto případě tedy více než pětiprocentní.

Další výskyty elipsy jsou také analyzovány. U nich však není patrná žádná výraznější odlišnost, což je ovšem v mnoha případech zapříčiněno malým počtem výskytů, jelikož není možné stavět výsledek analýzy na rozdílu o jeden výskyt, při celkovém počtu tří výskytů.

Následující kapitola analytické části je věnována návratnosti elipsy v twitterových zprávách. Strukturální návratnost je patrně nejčastější u tweetů rodilých mluvčí, u kterých se tato návratnost projevila v 39% případů, zatímco nerodilí mluvčí preferují situační návratnost, na což poukazuje výskyt ve 44.6% případů. Anaforická návratnost je tak

odsunuta na druhou kolej se svými 24.7% u rodilých a 21.5% u nerodilých mluvčí. Kataforická návratnost se v korpusu objevovala minimálně, celkem však v 5 případech.

Posledním analyzovaným faktorem byla pozice elipsy. Naprostá většina elips se objevila v počáteční pozici. To je patrné zejména u nerodilých mluvčí, kde se tato elipsa objevila v 92.3% případů, což je neuvěřitelné číslo. U rodilých mluvčí se jedná o výskyt v 84.4% případů, což je zapříčiněno zejména větším podílem rodilých mluvčí u elipsy ve střední pozici, kterou rodilí mluvčí využili v 8 případech, zatímco nerodilí mluvčí pouze ve 3 případech. Konečná pozice elipse se objevila pouze v 6 případech, kde 4 z nich byly ve tweetech rodilých mluvčí.

Je také nutné zmínit rozpor, který nastává u elipsy v twitterových zprávách. Mnozí autoři totiž zmiňují, že elipsa se nejčastěji objevuje v konečné pozici a ve spojení s anaforickou návratností. To je však zcela v rozporu s výsledkem této analýzy. Tento rozpor lze však poměrně snadno odůvodnit. Omezený rozsah twitterových zpráv zapříčiňuje, že se na twitteru neobjevuje velké množství souvětí. Anaforická návratnost a konečná pozice se však objevují zejména v souvětích. Je tedy zřejmé, že pro elipsu ve twitterových zprávách platí odlišná pravidla. Nejčastější elipsou je zde elipsa podmětu a operátoru. Návratnost těchto jevů bývá obvykle situační. V případě twitteru by se však dalo argumentovat, že elipsa podmětu, či podmětu a operátoru na začátku tweetu je doprovázena anaforickou návratností, jelikož u každého tweetu je napsáno i jméno autora, a pokud autor použije elipsu podmětu na začátku tweetu, je téměř jisté, že vynechaným podmětem je jeho osoba, jež je zmíněna právě v nadpisu každého tweetu. Pokud by měl autor v úmyslu mluvit o další osobě, elipsu by nepoužil.

Je tedy zřejmé, že elipsa se u twitterových zpráv vyskytuje poměrně často. Běžná pravidla se však na tyto výskyty nevztahují z důvodu rozdílného charakteru vět užívaných v twitteru a běžných textech. Nakonec lze ještě dodat, že elipsa se objevila 142x ve vzorku 140 tweetů. Lze tedy obecně říci, že každý průměrný tweet obsahuje 1 elipsu.

References

1. Aarts, Bas. 2011. Oxford Modern English Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Alexander, L. G., and R. A. Close. 1988. Longman English Grammar. London: Longman.
3. Azar, Betty Scrampfer. 1999. Understanding and Using English Grammar. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
4. Biber, Douglas, and Randolph Quirk. 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. New York: Longman.
5. Carter, Ronald, and Michael McCarthy. 2006. Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide: Spoken and Written English Grammar and Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Collins Cobuild. 1990. English Grammar. London: Collins.
7. Halliday, M. A. K., and Jonathan Webster. 2014. Text Linguistics: The How and Why of Meaning. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing.
8. Halliday, M.A.K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1995. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
9. Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2005. A student's introduction to English grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
11. Jacobs, Roderick A. 1995. English Syntax: A Grammar for English Language Professionals. New York: Oxford University Press.
12. Leech, Geoffrey N., Benita Cruickshank, and Roz Ivanic. 1989. An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage. London: Edward Arnold.
13. Quirk, Randolph. 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.

Corpus

List of abbreviations

S – subject ellipsis

O – operator ellipsis

Obj – object ellipsis

Det – determiner ellipsis

V – verb ellipsis

VP – verb phrase ellipsis

Prep – preposition ellipsis

Conj – conjunction ellipsis

Inf – infinite marker ellipsis

Adv – adverbial ellipsis

Cla – clausal ellipsis

Ana – anaphoric ellipsis

Cata – cataphoric ellipsis

Sit – situational ellipsis

Str – structural ellipsis

Ini – initial ellipsis

Med – medial ellipsis

Fin – final ellipsis

Native speakers

A – @MonteCristo https://twitter.com/MonteCristo

A1: Thanks for tuning into the Edith Finch <stream> (obj, cata, fin) and <thanks for tuning into> (S+V, ana, ini) Event[0] stream. <I> (S, sit, ini) Had some fun with narrative games!

A2: <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) Going to stream some Event[0] game now. Come help me think up questions for an unbalanced AI:

A3: <I have>(s+o, sit, ini) Rebooted and <I have> (s+o, sit, ini) changed servers so everything should be golden now

A4: <It has>(s+o, sit, ini) Been a long time but I'm going to stream me playing What Remains of Edith Finch:

A5: I wish <that>(conj, str, med) I could be a bookie for this:

A6: Apex observers are doing <a> (det, str, ini) fantastic work this season.

A7: <A> (det, str, ini) Helpful feature for all of those of you who ask me when the next OW tournament is scheduled.

A8: <It is> (s+o, sit, ini) Nice to see someone put in the time to dig into this with the plethora of documents available.

A9: <It is> (s+o, sit, ini) Great to see Open Division integrated into LAN qualifiers for Apex Challengers in Korea. <It is>(s+o, ana, ini) <a> (det, str, ini) Clear progression from amateur to pro.

A10: Full rosters <are> (V, str, ini) now out for all World Cup teams. <It>(S, str, ini) Should be a busy July!

B - @RiotJatt https://twitter.com/RiotJatt

B1: Also if listening to #TheDiveLoL on youtube isn't for you (since it's a podcast) you can still grab it on soundcloud

B2: <It is>(s+o, sit, ini) Good to be back on #TheDiveLoL We talk about: Mean people, What "Best in the West" means, Patch 7.12 NA LCS

B3: <I am>(s+o, sit, ini) Sitting down to record #TheDiveLoL right now with @RiotKobe and <with> (prep, ana, ini) @RiotAzael <We are>(s+o, ana, ini) Looking for a couple more twitter questions for end of show.

B4: Goldenglue has NEVER LOST with Syndra. #NALCS #Usingstatstherightway

B5: You wanted to watch CLG vs. TSM? <It is>(s+o, str, ini) Too bad, FOX and C9 decided to play forever #NALCS #80minutesthedream

B6: Twitter, is it a perfect game if the enemy gets Rift Herald? Aka did C9 just perfect game C9

B7: For those wondering, I've missed the last week of work with Strep Throat. <I>(S, ana, ini) Have been on antibiotics and <I>(S, ana, ini) should return this Friday!

B8: You can also find our Mid-season <power rankings episode of #TheDiveLoL on soundcloud as per usual> (obj+adv, cata, fin) and <you can also find> (S+V, ana, ini) #NALCS power rankings episode of #TheDiveLoL on Soundcloud as per usual.

B9: <The> (Det, str, ini) First video version of #TheDiveLoL is live! We cover Midseason <Power rankings> (obj, cata, fin) and <we cover> (S+V, ana, ini) #NALCS Power rankings

B10: <We are> (s+o, sit, ini) Filming our first video episode of #TheDiveLoL later today with @RiotKobe and <with> (prep, ana, ini) @RiotAzael < Are there>(s+o, str, ini) Any twitter questions for the end of the episode?

C - @c9_meteos https://twitter.com/c9_meteos

C1: <I am>(s+o, sit, ini) Getting a root canal right now, wish me luck boys

C2: <The> (det, str, ini) Tomb of Sargeras is lit

C3: Welcome to the team, young padawan

C4: <A> (det, str, ini) Shameless birthday stream

C5: !!! @jununyx made me the coolest picture for my birthday :D Thank you so much

C6: Imagine a two trick pony named "Im diggin graves" who only plays graves and yorick.

C7: I really like wholesome memes

C8: I felt really light headed, my body felt tingly and I started sweating everywhere. The dentist said <that>(conj, str, med) it was probably a vasovagal reaction

C9: <I have> (s+o, sit, ini) Just had a panic attack at the dentist office 0.0 that was weird, <I have> (s+o, ana, ini) never experienced something like that before

C10: <I am>(s+o, sit, ini) streamin

D - @scarra https://twitter.com/scarra

D1: <It >(S, str, ini) Feels like every week teams ask the question "can sven play lee?" To which they quickly find out <that> (conj, str, med) the answer is yes

D2: Slooshi and RO <are> (o, str, ini) trying hard to carry that piglet suicide play <on> (prep, str, ini) top lane. <The> (det, str, ini) Mid is REALLY far ahead now.

D3: <I have been> (s+o, sit, ini) Seeing these a lot, and I figured I'd try one as well

D4: We praise immortals over at @GreatestLeagueT today with @TheeMarkZ @XellTweets

D5: Olleh ruined this game noooooo

D6: Flame is immortal

D7: TL swapped 2 players?? uhh alright let's see how they perform

D8: I really enjoy seeing bjerg's zil make a return. It's really strong into malz and <it> (S, ana, ini) feels less supporty than standard support mid picks.

D9: Honestly p1 lost all their games before they gave out fidget spinners. I'm not saying <that> (conj, str, med) there's a correlation, I'm just saying keep doing it

D10: If you guys ever want to cop some limited delta fox stuff here it is. @JINX http://bit.ly/2rMkNK7 2 weeks left in the season #DELTAFOX

E - @TheeMarkZ https://twitter.com/TheeMarkZ

E1 - <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) Doing an AMA on LoL subreddit with @GreatestLeagueT cohosts @scarra & @XellTweets. <You may> (S+o, sit, ini) Ask any non GLTS questions too.

E2 - <It is> (s+o, sit, ini) Nice tweet about @GreatestLeagueT going live @scarra...

E3 - Statistically, there is an 85% chance <that> (conj, str, med) you like me

E4 - Today we find out if I'm going to Boston or <if> (conj, ana, ini) <I'am> (s+o, ana, ini) not <going to Boston> (VP, ana, fin) apparently. I'm feeling good about this

E5 - I'm bringing back <the> (det, str, ini) forum signatures. Every tweet of mine from now on will include it. #BringBackSigs

E6 – Hmmm <It was>(s+o, sit, ini) really hard fought series between DIG and IMT <I> (S, sit, ini) can't wait to break that one down.

E7 - MY FELLOW CASTERS ARE AGAINST ME, I NEED YOUR HELP #TAKEMARK

E8 - I've been playing a lot of Marth recently, I'm too slow to do 2 fairs in a short hop. <Do you have> (s+o+V, sit, ini) Any tips other than "Be Faster"?

E9 - Did I really just read a comment chain of people trying to argue that esports lead to a healthier lifestyle than traditional sports...?

E10 - Get ready for the Delta Fox set. <It is>(s+o, ana, ini) <a> (det, str, ini) Pinnacle of League of Legends. Skt watches their vods.

F - @PapaSmithy - https://twitter.com/PapaSmithy

F1: <We are> (s+o, sit, ini) Live with Great matches today! 4 teams <are> (V, str, ini) in the hunt for playoffs as Samsung take on Longzhu then Jin Air vs. Afreeca

F2: <The>(det, str, ini) Second Teaser for OGN's Ronaldo x Faker Documentary is up, this time we focus on Faker

F3: This all but confirms <that>(conj, str, med) the players will be able to focus on training and <this all but confirms> (S+V, ana, ini) <that> (conj, str, med) a derailment in performance like Spring is unlikely. <It is> (s+o, sit, ini) Great news!

F4: KeSPA will take temporary control of Longzhu Gaming until the end of the year after their previous instability

F5: I wish Mickey all the best, he is a unique talent that hopefully will find a good home

F6: Rox tried to reinvent themselves as a team around Sangyoon in Summer - Mickey played a completely different champion pool and <Mickey> (S, ana, ini) looked poor

F7: I see people downplaying Mickey super hard - remember he was 2nd place in regular season MVP only to Crown in Spring 2017

F8: Lava is Taehoon, <a> (det, str, ini) former Substitute Support for SKT T1 - he roleswapped to mid in 2017

F9: <A> (det, str, ini) Big change to Rox Tigers #LCK Squad for 2nd round robin - Mickey is no longer part of the squad

F10: Only SKT can play outscale against kt Rolster and <Only SKT can> (s+o, ana, ini) make it look easy despite surrendering the early to mid game - tremendous series #LCK

G - @AchiliosCasts - https://twitter.com/AchiliosCasts

G1: <We are> (s+o, sit, ini) Going live w/ @PapaSmithy for a hype day of matches! SSG vs LZ and then JAG vs AF.

G2: Tears were shed over this wonderfully competitive Telecom War. I need a drink after that wild ride

G3: The win streak continues for Blank as SKT close out the first Telecom War of summer! #LCK

G4: Fear not, I always keep a spare. I'm back on the stream w/ audio. <It is> (s+o, str, ini) Time to order a new Sennheiser though.

G5: DOESNT SHE REALIZE THAT I HAVE A TELECOM WAR TO WATCH?

G6: Cool my cat chewed through my headset wire just now

G7: How to enjoy the Telecom War and not <to> (inf, ana, ini) be a biased caster #LCK

G8: The first Telecom War of #LCK Summer 2017 starts now! http://Twitch.tv/lck1

G9: <I am> (S+o, sit, ini) Interested to see who SKT will be starting for today's matches. Who do you think we'll see?

G10: <I> (S, sit, ini) Woke up super early this morning and <I> (S, ana, ini) couldn't fall back asleep. I think my excitement for the Telecom War has something to do with it!

Non-native speakers

nA - @FreezeLoL

Non-native speakers

nA1- I am still contracted with Tempo Storm, but I am allowed to entertain offers for the next split. Contact me on DM or lolfreezecz@gmail.com

nA2 - If u are playing jhin lategame sell the swifties and <If you are playing Jihn lategame> (cla, ana, ini) buy attack speed boots. Trust me.

nA3 – It's pretty funny that Ahri takes towers 2 times faster than fed twitch.

nA4 - Braum is a free win in soloq.

nA5 - I really enjoy when I play vs duo botlane but I cant duo myself. Where is the logic in that.

nA6 - Its crazy that the temperature in california and <the temperature> (obj, ana, ini) <in> (prep, ana, ini) Czech republic is exactly the same LOL.

nA7 - <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) Having really great games anytime I get master diamond players. They are definitely the up and coming talent in NA. <They> (S, ana, ini) Always run it down mid

nA8 - Blitz is op or what

nA9 - Both times they play Freeze they lose :thinking: XD Its lost GGwp @eUnitedgg

nA10 - <I am> (S+o, sit, ini) Playing @eUnitedgg today! Wish me luck :p

nB - @FroggenLoL https://twitter.com/FroggenLoL

nB1 - <I am/ We are> (S+o, sit, ini) Playing TSM today.

nB2 - <I have> (S+o, sit, ini) just dropped my icecream. Sigh

nB3 - <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) on for a few hours again

nB4 - <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) online for a few hours

nB5 - <I am> (S+o, sit, ini) https://www.twitch.tv/froggen on for a few hours

nB6 - <It was> (s+o, sit, ini) <a> (det, str, ini) Sad 1-2 loss to dig :(

nB7 - <I am / We are> (s+o, sit, ini) READY FOR TODAY

nB8 - <A> (det, str, ini) Reminder that we're playing at 6PM tomorrow against envy

nB9 - It's such a nice day today

nB10 - <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) on for about 2hours

nC - @nukeducklol https://twitter.com/nukeducklol

nC1 - But trust me when I tell you guys that im working as hard as I can each day and in the end it will pay off :)

nC2 – I'm really not happy to keep not going to play-offs and <I'm really not happy about> (cla, ana, ini) not beeing able to compete with the top 6 teams.

nC3 - Is it mathematically possible to win lane vs D shield?

nC4 - I hate it when i get flamed so i cannot focus on the game ; (

nC5 - If you play only 1 champ and <you> (S, ana, ini) are still stuck in master tier, do not use <the> (det, str, ini) chat please :)

nC6 - Shout out to my biggest fans @EliayLipp and @G2Perkz ty for the RTs guys, i appricate it :)

nC7 - Ty for free branding guys :) @EliayLipp @G2Perkz @FebivenLoL

nC8 - My hate for golem takers was fueled by fear

nC9 - i play passive

nC10 - Nvm i will let my jungler get golem adv

nD - @MarcelFeldkamp https://twitter.com/MarcelFeldkamp

nD1: <Are there> (S+o, sit, ini) Any must buys from the Steam Summer sale? <I am> (S+o, sit, ini) Having lots of fun playing Divinity at the moment in co-op

nD2: <I> (S, sit, ini) Pulled pork with extra bacon and pibeapple BBQ sauce. I thought pineapple on pizza is good but this is next level

nD3: <A> (Det, str, ini) Friend of mine INSTANTLY copped 2 pairs and I'm sitting here taking another L for sure

nD4: Technology truly evolved over the last 20 years

nD5: I love threads like this on reddit

nD6: When is it socially acceptable to start drinking in your country? <At> (prep, str, ini) Noon? <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) Asking for a friend

nD7: Who am I kidding? I just hope <that> (conj, str, med) I get first row seats to that cringefest

nD8: <I had> (S+o, sit, ini) Better hope her opening statement includes that esports is officially recognized as a sport by the government or I'm not interested

nD9: You know you play 90s games when they won't let you skip that intro. WHO STILL HAS THE TIME TO WATCH THESE INTROS

nD10: I really miss L.A. <There was> (s+o, str, ini) Good weather and <There was> (s+o, str, ini) good food. <I> (S, ana, ini) Need to move back ASAP, <I am> (S+o, ana, ini) hoping for <the> (det, str, ini) end of the year

nE - @G2mithy https://twitter.com/G2mithy

nE1: If you could <travel> (V, cata, fin), where would you travel to?

nE2: Sometimes I sleep so much <that> (conj, str, med) I think my body doesn't realise its woken up and I feel sleepy for the rest of the day. life is hard .

nE3: <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) going to stream 2 or 3 soloq games before scrims!

nE4: Doing leg day on a hot day is a tough experience ><

nE5: I like how trick was like: 'Im Zac I don't need weapon

nE6: <There is>(s+o, sit, ini) <an> (det, str, ini) Early morning stream!

nE7: 2 or 3 games before scrims

nE8: <It> (S, sit, ini) Sucks. <It is> (S+o, str, ini) Time to just look forward to our @NiPGaming game. We will be able to get some time after to learn the patch and <to> (inf, ana, ini) improve. Ggwp @FNATIC

nE9: Going to the gym is painful

nE10: <It is> (S+o, str, ini) Time to stream!

nF - @C9Jensen - https://twitter.com/C9Jensen

nF1: <It was> (S+o, sit, ini) <a> (det, str, ini) Gg dig! <It was a> (s+o, sit, ini) Tough series, <I/it> (S, str, ini) felt like I made more mistakes than usual but <I am> (S+o, ana, ini) happy with the result regardless c(:

nF2: <It was> (s+o, sit, ini) <a> (det, str, ini) Ggwp liquid

nF3: Ggs FLY <It was> (s+o, sit, ini) <a> (det, str, ini) 1-1 week for us but I believe <that> (conj, str, med) we learned a lot

nF4: <It is> (s+o, sit, ini) unfortunate :(ggs IMT

nF5: <It was> (s+o, sit, ini) A much better week for us, <I/we> (S, sit, ini) still have stuff to work on but <I am/ we are> (s+o, sit, ini) happy with the results!

nF6: <It was> (S+o, sit, ini) <a> (det, str, ini) GG @clgaming <It was> (s+o, sit, ini) not my best performance, tomorrow will be a new and <tomorrow will be> (VP, ana, ini) a better day :)

nF7: #G2WIN I believe in my european brothers

nF8: I did a reflections interview with Thorin, it covers a lot of subjects about me and <it covers a lot of subjects about> (cla, ana, ini) my history if you're interested!

nF9: <I am> (s+o, sit, ini) so exicted to watch sneakys stream tonight !!

nF10: I always fall short when it matters the most, I'm sorry to all my fans & especially <to> (inf, ana, ini) my team. <The> (det, str, ini) Game 5 was 100% on me. Ggs

nG - @CarlosR - https://twitter.com/CarlosR

nG1: Thanks to all of you that bought the (quite pricey) G2 mask. We truly love you. #G2ARMY

nG2: No job is too small <for a winner> (objC, cata, fin) or <no job is> (S+V, ana, ini) too big for a winner. Thank you, people!

nG3: Let's retake the World Championship - it belongs to us. Yesterday's victory is the first step to taste greatness again. Let's go boys!

nG4: When your players are the reason of a nerf

nG5: Thanks for buying it, buddy. We are grateful to have you here my man

nG6: Thank you for buying it. We are blessed to have you on board #G2ARMY

nG7: <-> Same <-> (+ reference to another tweet) (Cannot be analysed, not recoverable)

nG8: Hahahahahahhahaahhahaha <There are> (S+o, str, ini) So many people to fire after this tweet

nG9: When your wife is just insane ft. my son's feet

nG10: Yes but I want cake now