The Peculiarities of Incomplete Sentences in Comparison with Uzbek and Modern English

Hilola Zubaydullaeva *
Teacher of English at the Chair of English Philology, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article discusses the issues of incomplete sentences in Uzbek and modern English. The concept of incomplete sentences has been of great importance to linguists from different parts of the world. There were no special works devoted to incomplete sentences. The main significant studies on this issue were the dissertation of A.N. Nazarov and the work of I.A. Popova, and it is concluded that it is impossible to give a satisfactory definition of incomplete sentences based on grammatical structure, as well as the impossibility of putting forward clear criteria for dividing sentences into complete and incomplete.

Key Words: *incomplete sentences, modern English, grammatical structure, clear criteria, dividing sentences.*

Arizona, USA

Exploring the notion of incomplete sentences and providing a comprehensive definition of complete sentences is crucial for establishing a shared understanding. The definition of a sentence has sparked ongoing debates and varied interpretations among linguists, both within and across linguistic directions. Despite the lack of a universally satisfactory resolution, this article adopts the definition offered by the Academic grammar of the Russian language as a practical framework. According to this perspective, a sentence is viewed as a grammatically structured unit of speech, serving as the primary tool for forming, expressing, and conveying thoughts. Notably, a sentence not only conveys information about reality but also reflects the speaker's attitude towards it. The internal unity of verbally expressed components, their arrangement, and intonation are integral aspects of a sentence from a grammatical standpoint.

In terms of conveying a message, every coherent sentence serves its purpose by effectively communicating what needs to be expressed. For a sentence to qualify as such, it must fulfill its primary communicative function; otherwise, it would not meet the criteria of a sentence. Regardless of their structural characteristics, sentences within a given context fully express the ideas contained in them. This is crucial, as incomplete transmission of messages through sentences would render interpersonal communication impossible. Hence, viewed from this perspective, the concept of incomplete sentences ceases to exist entirely.

Instances of informal speech, classified by I.A. Popova as "undeveloped" or "essentially incomplete sentences," signify thoughts lacking sufficient differentiation, remaining unresolved and not yet distinctly combined into verbal representations. Essentially, these expressions indicate thoughts that have not been fully shaped, preventing them from becoming a fully realized linguistic phenomenon. Such formations cannot be considered sentences at all, a definition passed down from A.A. Shakhmatov, which categorizes them as either "sufficiently" or "insufficiently" differentiated. In other words, if a thought has not yet sufficiently evolved into a linguistic phenomenon, it will never transform into a fully articulated sentence.

The author of the article acknowledges this by describing such expressions as "language formations that have not yet become full sentences." In this context, the term "incomplete" extends beyond grammatical considerations and pertains to a specific conceptual framework. In grammar, the term "incomplete proposal" characterizes distinct positional models relative to the positional models of complete sentences. Consequently, the term "incomplete sentence" does not apply to unexpanded expressions, as these, as the author emphasizes, have not transitioned into fully formed sentences.

Based on the aforementioned evidence, it can be concluded is that when examining a sentence within its context and assessing completeness of

meaning, all sentences are inherently complete. From this perspective, sentences that are deemed incomplete do not exist. In any given context or situation, each sentence, considering its structure and function, is comprehensive in terms of content. In this context, we differ in opinion from A.N. Nazarov, the author of the dissertation "Incomplete Sentences in Russian," who asserts that "the incompleteness of a sentence is primarily determined by the semantic incompleteness of its content." This perspective leads to the exploration of grammatical phenomena solely through the subjective interpretation of the meaning of corresponding sentences, relying on the intuitive linguistic sense of the researcher. Consequently, it results in subjective assessments and conclusions.

This study employs a descriptive research approach, drawing inspiration from Z. Harris and C. H. Friz. By applying their methodology, the study successfully streamlines the diverse array of specific sentences found in texts into a limited set of models. In certain instances, elements of transformational analysis were incorporated to substantiate specific positions, serving the purpose of "identifying language units at the syntactic level." The utilization of these methods has proven effective in clarifying the characteristics of both incomplete and complete sentence models.

To delineate the scope of distribution for a particular model of incomplete sentences, contingent on the lexical meaning and grammatical form of its constituent words, a calculation method was employed. This approach facilitated the determination of a specific probability level associated with the occurrence of a given model of incomplete sentences.

Indeed, a considerable portion of formally complete sentences in coherent speech, when removed from their context, fails to convey the full depth of thought that they possess within that context. The semantic connection between contextual sentences and the relative inadequacy of an isolated sentence is demonstrated through various means, such as the use of pronouns (both personal and demonstrative), conjunctive particles, conjunctions at the start of sentences, introductory words, and other devices. For instance, consider the following sentences: "His political work is smaller in volume and narrower in range than that of his two great contemporaries, but it reflects more clearly than the poetry of either, the collapse of faith that was a tragedy in many sincere lives of the period." Nevertheless, this sentence cannot be regarded as complete in meaning or even clear in content without a preceding sentence that establishes the subject relationship of personal pronouns: "Eminent alike as poet and critic, Matthew Arnold holds a place of singular distinction among Victorian writers" [6]. However, even this sentence lacks complete clarity without a more extensive preceding context, as the content of the group "two great contemporaries" remains unclear [7].

When a sentence is considered within its context, viewed as a part of the whole, it gains full meaning. This

Arizona, USA

observation aligns with V.V. Vinogradov's insight: "Taking into account all the means of expression, situation, and context, considering the structural and grammatical features of the so-called incomplete sentences, almost every one of them will be 'complete,' i.e., adequate to its purpose and effectively performing its communicative function" [8]. In assessing sentence incompleteness, the perspective taken is that a sentence, in terms of its model, is not a product of creative expression; rather, it represents a pre-established, replicable unit. "The positional model of the proposition is a ready-made tool, a pre-existing structure." From the standpoint of its model, a sentence is a linguistic unit—not because it can express a complete thought, but because it is a fixed structure, a prepared model reproduced in speech as an identifiable structure.

Simultaneously, errors in speech may arise from deviations in the developed models within the language system; certain components of these models might be omitted. However, this doesn't negate the fact that a sentence like "Wish I were the same" is not a novel construction but rather embodies the same positional model (structure) as the sentence "I wish I were the same." Similarly, consider the statement "You coming, Scobie?"—it can only function as a communicative unit because its positional model aligns precisely with the positional model of the sentence "Are you coming, Scobie?" These errors or incomplete structures derive from and are constructed based on existing models within the language system. They remain intelligible solely because they adhere closely to the complete sentence's exact structure. For instance, sentences such as "Very pretty, that" or:

An incomplete sentence arises from a violation of positional models, and this occurrence is facilitated by the close interconnection of individual positional elements. This close linkage allows for a situation where a position in one verbal form may be assumed by a different position in other verbal forms, and even by the entire positional model of the sentence. For instance:

Hallo, Jim, how is it going?

Badly. I'll wait for you, he said in an urgent undertone.

In the porch.

Both of the chosen sentences are associated with complete sentences through the absence of a verbal form in the predicate position. These sentences are characterized by dependent circumstantial positions, which presuppose the presence of the predicate position and, consequently, the subject. In the first case, this is evident in "It is going bad," and in the second, it is exemplified by "I'll wait in the porch."

This interdependence, termed by V.G. Admoni as the "projection of syntactic relations" of the copula position, indicates the omission of the verbal form in one or more elements. Additionally, the loss of the verbal form in one of the sentences is corroborated by corresponding sets of sentences. T.P. Lomtev articulated this concept, stating, "The position of the verbal form in a sentence is determined not only by the data representing a single sentence taken in isolation but also by those representing correlative series of

Arizona, USA

different types of sentences, i.e., language systems in general." Building on this evidence, much like T.P. Lomtev, we assert that the distinction between incomplete and complete sentences is not contingent on the absence of specific positions but rather on the fact that incomplete sentences are "presented negatively, i.e., they are not represented by separate verbal forms."

In conclusion, we establish that an incomplete sentence is a straightforward two-part sentence, characterized by an incomplete expression of the positional model in verbal forms, where one or both of the primary positions are presented negatively. This assertion is substantiated by the connections and formations of the available copula position. Incomplete sentences maintain a connection with complete sentences and effectively convey the blogger's message through two key factors: context and situation. The lack of word forms in secondary positions does not render the sentence incomplete. It's important to note that the term "incomplete sentence" pertains to a structural and grammatical concept rather than a semantic one.

References

[1]. Admoni V.G. Completeness of construction as a phenomenon of syntactic form. Voprosy yazykoznania, №1, 1958. – P.111-117

[2]. Barsova O.M. Two-part verbal sentences in English. NDVSh FN, 1962.

[3]. Burieva U.A. "Characteristic features of incomplete sentences". Theoretical and applied sciences Volume:80/Issue:12/December/2019, – P.557-560.

[4]. Burieva U.A. "Incomplete syntactic constructions in cognitive-discursive information and isofunctional aspects". IJRD Volume:5/Issue:4/April 2020, – P.344.

[5]. Chomsky N. Syntactic structures. New In Linguistics, vol. 2, -M., 1962.

[6]. Dudyk P.S. Incomplete and elliptic sentences in the modern Ukrainian language. abstract of cand...diss. -Kiev, 1954.

[7]. Grammar of the Russian language. Academy of Sciences of the USSR. -M., 1954.

[8]. Harris Z. Joint occurrence and transformation in the linguistic structure. "New in Linguistics", vol. 2, -M., 1962;

[9]. Kolshansky G.V. On the nature of the context. -NY. 1959.

[10]. Fries Ch. The structure of English. -N.Y., 1952.

[11]. Fitialova S.Ya. Problems in structural linguistics. –M., 1962. p.108.

[12]. Lomteva T.P. Fundamentals of the syntax of the modern Russian language. Uchpedgiz, 1958.

[13]. Nazarov A.N. Incomplete proposals, conditions for their use and their structure. -Penza, 1950.

[14]. Peshkovsky A.M. Ruskiy sintaksis v nauchnom osveshenii. –M. Uchpedgiz. 1956. – 511p.

[15]. Sadullaeva N.A., Mamatova F.B. Classification of euphemism and its formation in the Uzbek language. Journal of critical reviews. Vol 7, Issue 4. (Scopus) March 23, 2020. Malaysia. ISSN 2394-5125 http://www.jcreview.com/fulltext/197-1584972123.pdf/1586606700

Arizona, USA