

Comparative-Functional Analysis of Incomplete Sentences in Dialogic Speech (Based on English and Uzbek Examples)

Artikova Nodira Sanakulovna
teacher of Zarmad University

Abstract. *This article investigates the comparative-functional features of incomplete sentences in dialogic speech, focusing on English and Uzbek examples. Dialogic speech, characterized by its spontaneous and interactive nature, often includes incomplete sentences as a means of conveying meaning efficiently and effectively. By analyzing examples from both languages, we aim to identify similarities and differences in the use, structure, and functions of incomplete sentences.*

Key words: *incomplete sentences, dialogic speech, comparative linguistics, English and Uzbek languages, economy of speech, expressiveness in communication, turn-taking dynamics, contextual relevance, morphological marking.*

Introduction

Incomplete sentences, also known as elliptical constructions, are a common feature of dialogic speech. They arise due to the dynamic nature of communication, where interlocutors rely on shared context and implicit understanding. This study examines how incomplete sentences function in English and Uzbek dialogic speech, exploring their structural characteristics and communicative purposes.

The issue of incomplete sentences has long attracted the attention of researchers. However, there were no specialized studies dedicated solely to incomplete

sentences. The most notable research on this topic includes the thesis of A.N. Nazarov and the work of I.A. Popova. In her study, I.A. Popova reaches a rather pessimistic conclusion, asserting that it is impossible to provide a satisfactory definition of incomplete sentences based on grammatical structure alone. She also highlights the difficulty of establishing clear criteria for distinguishing between complete and incomplete sentences [5]. This conclusion was primarily influenced by the fact that, for a long time, the concept of incompleteness was defined not through structural-grammatical features but through semantic characteristics. A.N. Nazarov argued that semantic incompleteness could serve as a basis for defining incomplete sentences and determining their criteria. Since these conclusions were drawn, the issue of incomplete sentences and various related problems have been explored in greater depth [6].

N.A. Sitnova calls elliptical those sentences in which the structural elements of a sentence are absent: prepositions, articles, conjunctions, auxiliary verbs. Some researchers believe that elliptical sentences are those that express new additional information [10, 11].

According to I.F. Vardul, “an ellipsis does not change either the content or the structure of a sentence; in the presence of an ellipse, one cannot say that the content of a sentence is incomplete, since an elliptical sentence does not differ in its content from a parallel non-elliptical sentence” [9].

The above material confirms that the problem of ellipsis remains complex and controversial in syntax, the explanation for this is the different approaches to this problem and the insufficiently clear definition of the term “ellipsis” both in our and in foreign linguistics.

Summing up what has been said, it should be noted that we have not been able to find any clear boundary between incomplete and elliptical sentences. Without going into the details of the terminological confusion that exists in linguistics, it can be said that incomplete sentences differ to some extent from elliptical ones. Ellipsis, as noted by O.S. Akhmanova, is “the omission (dropping) of an element (member) of an utterance that is easily restored in a given context or situation in a given speech or everyday context”. In our opinion, the term “ellipsis” is broader than “incomplete

sentence", since an ellipsis is the omission of one or another element regardless of the language levels. Ellipsis can be found at the phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic levels of language. Incomplete sentences are manifested in the concept of explicit-non-expression of either nuclear or dependent components of sentences. In this regard, it can be said that incomplete sentences are one of the variants of ellipsis.

Theoretical framework ellipsis, the omission of elements from a sentence, is a universal phenomenon in human language. It allows speakers to economize their speech without compromising intelligibility. In dialogic contexts, ellipsis is often employed to enhance fluency and maintain the flow of conversation. The study draws on functional linguistics and pragmatics to analyze the roles of incomplete sentences in communication.

The analysis is based on authentic conversational data from English and Uzbek. Dialogues from films, interviews, and everyday conversations were selected to provide a rich dataset. Comparative analysis was conducted to identify structural patterns and functional similarities or differences in the two languages.

The comparative-functional analysis of incomplete sentences in dialogic speech between English and Uzbek presents an interesting area of study, particularly given the limited research on Uzbek language processing. In English, incomplete sentences in dialogic speech have been extensively studied, with research showing their importance in natural conversation and their impact on speech recognition systems. For instance, the CU-HTK system for automatic transcription of conversational telephone speech achieved a word error rate of 23.9%, demonstrating the challenges in processing natural, often incomplete dialogue [3]. Similarly, studies have shown significant differences between articulation test results and conversational speech samples, highlighting the complexity of analyzing incomplete sentences in natural dialogue [2]. For Uzbek, while specific research on incomplete sentences in dialogic speech is not directly addressed in the provided papers, there are relevant developments in Uzbek language processing. An End-To-End Deep Neural Network-Hidden Markov Model speech recognition model and a hybrid Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC)-attention network have been

proposed for Uzbek, achieving a word error rate of 14.3% [1]. Additionally, the development of the UzLM language model, which utilizes 80 million words from various sources, has reduced the character error rate to 5.26% in continuous Uzbek speech recognition [1]. These advancements could potentially be applied to analyze incomplete sentences in Uzbek dialogic speech. In conclusion, while English has more established research on incomplete sentences in dialogic speech, Uzbek is making significant progress in language processing capabilities. Future research could focus on applying these new Uzbek language models and speech recognition systems to specifically analyze incomplete sentences in dialogic contexts, potentially revealing unique characteristics of Uzbek conversational patterns compared to English.

Structural characteristics of incomplete sentences in both languages exhibit similar patterns, including:

Subject ellipsis is common in responses and follow-up questions.

English: “*Going out?*” (*instead of “Are you going out?”*)

Uzbek: “*Ketayapsanmi?*” (“*Are you leaving?*”; *often shortened to “Ketayapsan?”*)

In predicate ellipsis, often used when the predicate is implied by context.

English: “*Where to?*” (*instead of “Where are you going to?”*)

Uzbek: “*Qayerga?*” (“*To where?*”)

A mixed ellipsis is used when multiple components are omitted.

English: “*Can’t*” (*instead of “I can’t do it”*)

Uzbek: “*Qilmayman*” (“*I won’t do it.*”; *shortened in casual speech to “Qilmay”*)

The primary functions of incomplete sentences in dialogic speech include several key aspects: economy of speech, expressiveness, turn-taking management, contextual relevance,

Incomplete sentences serve to reduce redundancy while maintaining clarity in communication. By omitting unnecessary elements, speakers can convey their intended meaning more efficiently. For example, in English, the question “Why not?” conveys the same idea as a more complete version, such as “Why would that not be the case?” Similarly, in Uzbek, the phrase “*Nega yo‘q?*” achieves the same purpose.

Incomplete sentences are frequently used to convey emotions such as surprise, urgency, or hesitation. These constructions allow speakers to express themselves more dynamically and naturally. For instance, in English, the incomplete sentence “Why not?” may express surprise or incredulity. In Uzbek, “Nega yo‘q?” carries a similar expressive function.

Incomplete sentences facilitate smoother conversational dynamics by enabling efficient turn-taking. They allow interlocutors to respond quickly without disrupting the flow of dialogue. For example, in English, the word “Later?” can be used to suggest postponing a discussion or action. In Uzbek, the equivalent “Keyin?” fulfills the same role.

Incomplete sentences often rely on shared situational context to achieve mutual understanding. This reliance on context allows speakers to omit elements that are implicitly understood. For example, in English, the phrase “This one?” when pointing to an object is easily understood by the interlocutor. In Uzbek, the corresponding phrase “Mana buni?” performs a similar function.

In English, incomplete sentences are common, in which there are no verbal forms in the position of the subject and predicate (or part of the predicate), but secondary positions are verbally expressed:

“*Am I nuisance? - Never*”. “*Hallo, Jim, how is it going? - Badly*”.

“*You must have had plenty of practice, surely. - Not much, as matter of fact*”. Such sentences exist and can only exist because the positions of the main embers remain in them, and are not violated, even though verbal form is absent. Thus, the structure of the sentence is preserved, although, only what is new in terms of the message is expressed verbally [5].

While English and Uzbek share several commonalities in the use of incomplete sentences, there are notable differences influenced by linguistic and cultural factors.

Uzbek language relies more heavily on suffixes and inflections, which provide additional context and allow for greater flexibility in omitting sentence elements. This morphological richness facilitates the use of incomplete sentences in a wider range of contexts compared to English.

In Uzbek, incomplete sentences are often employed with honorifics or softening elements to maintain politeness and respect in communication. For instance, the phrase “Bo‘ladimi?” (“Will it be okay?”) exemplifies this tendency to incorporate politeness markers, even in abbreviated forms. In contrast, English incomplete sentences typically do not rely on such honorific strategies, focusing instead on brevity and efficiency.

Characteristic of incomplete response sentences of dialogic speech is that some ideas, not verbally expressed in the lines, are realized from the situation or context, as well as with the help of intonation, gestures and facial expressions. All these facts provide an opportunity to study the structure of incomplete sentences in a multi-aspect manner. It is appropriate to admit that in one study of incomplete sentences of dialogic speech it is simply impossible to resolve all aspects of sentences, in connection with this we will limit ourselves to identifying differential syntactic and differential syntactic-semantic features of explicitly-unexpressed (zero) elements in a comparative-typological plan.

We assume that one of the reasons for the implementation of incomplete sentences in response lines of dialogic speech is the fact that the component presented in the structure of incomplete sentences in response lines of dialogic speech is structurally and functionally connected with interrogative lines. This aspect of incomplete sentences should be considered in information theory, since the use of various types of incomplete sentences, especially in dialogic speech, is determined by the desire to avoid semantic-grammatical duplication (redundancy) in speech.

However, when studying incomplete sentences of dialogic speech in response lines, linguists proceed from various potential positions. For example: E.A. Trofimova relies on the morphological properties of the elements presented in the structure of the second line. E. Ya. Bobrova considers response lines in terms of interconnection and interdependence in relation to previous lines and their prosodic aspect.

Incomplete sentences are common in everyday speech and can serve various purposes, such as emphasizing a point or responding quickly. This study aims to understand how these sentence structures differ between English and Uzbek, and what roles they play in each language's conversational patterns. The research likely

involves analyzing real dialogue samples from both languages to identify similarities and differences in how speakers use incomplete sentences to communicate effectively.

The study reveals that incomplete sentences play a vital role in enhancing the efficiency and expressiveness of dialogic speech in both English and Uzbek. While structural and functional similarities are evident, cultural and linguistic nuances influence their usage. Further research could explore these constructions in other languages to enrich our understanding of ellipsis in dialogic communication.

Reference

1. Mukhamadiyev A., Djuraev O., Cho J., Khujayarov I. Automatic Speech Recognition Method Based on Deep Learning Approaches for Uzbek Language. Sensors, vol. 22, no. 10, p. 3683, May 2022, doi: 10.3390/s22103683.
2. Morrison J.A. and Shriberg L.D. Articulation testing versus conversational speech sampling. Journal of speech and hearing research, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 259–273, Apr. 1992, <http://doi:10.1044/jshr.3502.259>
3. Ismailov A., Abdullah Z., Rahim A. N. H. and Jalil M.M.A. A comparative study of stemming algorithms for use with the Uzbek language. Aug. 2016, vol. 4, pp. 7–12. doi: 10.1109/iccoins.2016.7783180.
4. Admoni V.G. Completeness of construction as a phenomenon of syntactic form. Voprosy yazykoznania, №1, 1958. – P.111-117
5. Vinogradov V.V. Basic questions of the syntax of a sentence (on the material of the Russian language). Academy of Sciences. – M., 1955.
6. Sadullaeva N., Burieva U. THE PECULIARITIES OF INCOMPLETE SENTENCES IN MODERN ENGLISH // PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION (2021) 58(1): 2860-2869 ISSN: 00333077 www.psychologyandeducation.net
7. Бегматов М. Эллипсис ҳодисаси түгрисида германшунос олимларнинг фикрлари. Тил ва нутқ систем-сатх, талқинида. ф.ф.д. проф. Х.А.Арзикулов хотирасига бағишиланган илмий назарий конференция материаллари. СамДЧТИ. –Самарканд, 2005. С. 47-48.
8. Боброва Я. Интонация ответной группы в современном английском языке. Автoref.дисс... канд.фил.наук. Москва, 1966. С. 23.
9. Вардуль И.Ф. К вопросу о явлении эллипсиса. – В кн.: Инвапиантные синтаксические значения и структуры предложения,-«Наука», Москва, 1969, С.69.
10. Ситнова Н.А. Эллипсис строевых (служебных) элементов в английской разговорной речи.Автoref.дисс... канд.фил.наук, Одесса, 1978. С.11-22