

THE PHENOMENON OF IDIOMS AND INCOMPLETE SENTENCES IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Ibragimova Muqaddas

Teacher of SamSIFL Samarkand, Uzbekistan.

Abstract: This article analyzes the communicative-pragmatic and anthropogenic nature of idioms and incomplete sentences. In the study, idioms are organized as independent communicative units in the speech process, and incomplete sentences are organized as syntactic structures that acquire meaning in contextual relationships. Also, the anthropogenic properties of these units related to the human factor, their role in expressing the speaker's emotional state, expressive purpose and psychological impact in communication are revealed. The article analyzes the communicative-pragmatic functions of idioms and incomplete sentences in the role of information transmission, expression of emotional state, and increasing the effectiveness of communication. As a result, the common and different aspects of these two phenomena in the modern language system from the point of view of an anthropocentric approach are identified.

Keywords: word-speech, word-speech, incomplete speech, communicative-pragmatics, anthropogenicity, expressiveness, context, virtual communication, structural-semantic approach, functional-communicative analysis, pragmatic unity.

Introduction

The issue of linguistic, structural-semantic and stylistic properties of utterances and incomplete sentences is widely studied in world and Russian linguistics. The scientific views of many scientists play an important role in the formation and development of this direction. In particular, foreign linguists, who initially interpreted utterances as exclamations, such as E. Sapir, L. Bloomfield, R. Jakobson, F. Ameka, L. Tresner, R.G. Montes, N. Halliday, E. Goffman, J.G. Herder, deeply analyzed their emotional and pragmatic nature, the possibilities of emotional expression in speech.

In Russian linguistics, the study of the grammatical nature of phrases and incomplete sentences was associated with the research of such scientists as M. V. Lomonosov, A. Kh. Vostokov, F. I. Buslaev, F. de Saussure, I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, A. A. Potebnya, whose ideas later created the theoretical basis for the formation of these phenomena as an independent grammatical category. In the following period, scientists such as A. A. Shakhmatov, V. V. Vinogradov, N. S. Valgina, G. A. Zolotova, P. A. Lekant, V. A. Beloshapkova, V. Yu. Melikyan, E. S. Skoblikova, O. B. Sirotinin, N. Yu. Shvedova, L. V. Shcherba, L. Yu. Maksimov comprehensively analyzed the structural-semantic properties, communicative-pragmatic functions, and stylistic possibilities of phrases and incomplete sentences.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The issue of interjections has also been in the center of attention in foreign linguistics. Many American and European scholars called these units interjections and interpreted them as syntactically independent units expressing an emotional reaction.

Russian linguists, however, approached this issue more deeply and analyzed interjections not only from an emotional, but also from a grammatical, stylistic, and communicative-pragmatic

point of view. They considered interjections as an independent structural-semantic type of the language system, emphasizing their role in expressing modality and expressiveness.

According to the American linguist E. Sapir, interjections are one of the least functionally significant units in the system of speech units. He noted that they [interjections] are a small and functionally insignificant part of the vocabulary of the language. They are like the final decorative part of the edge of a piece of cloth.

L. Bloomfield (1933) presented the words as natural exclamations that arise under the influence of a strong emotional state.

R. Jakobson considered them “a model of the pure emotional shell of language,” emphasizing that such units express the speaker’s mental state and emotional reaction.[4, P. 66-67]

In particular, R. Trask emphasizes that exclamations are an important linguistic means of expressing a person's emotional state, noting that they can appear in the form of a lexical unit or a compound.

The English linguist F. Ameka notes that exclamations, unlike other word classes, do not undergo morphological changes. They do not accept word-forming or word-modifying suffixes and are used in an invariable form. Therefore, they are close to such categories as prepositions and invariable adverbs. The scientist divides words into primary and secondary exclamations: primary exclamations (Oh!, Wow!, Ugh!) consist of purely emotional sounds, while secondary ones actually belong to other word classes (God!, Heavens!, Shame!), and are used in an exclamatory sense. In English linguistics, exclamations are classified differently depending on the function they perform.

L. Tresner divides interjections into the following types based on their semantic nature:

1. imperative interjections - these types of interjections are used to influence the listener's mind, address him, or express a command tone;
2. impulsive interjections - these interjections express the speaker's active, emotional-excited attitude to an event;
3. imitative interjections - this type includes words that imitate sounds or movements in nature.[7,P-420].

According to P. G. Montes, the use of exclamations is closely related to the speaker's purpose. In his opinion, “many exclamations express the speaker’s respect and inner attitude towards the listener. [6, P. 1289–1319]. Also, Quirk and others considered English utterances to be syntactically independent, grammatically unrelated, but expressing strong emotional meaning units. Some linguists also interpreted exclamations as paralinguistic units.

Although utterances and incomplete sentences were not initially formed as grammatical categories in Russian linguistics, the ideas of such scholars as Lomonosov, Vostokov, Buslaev, Saussure, Baudouin de Courtenay and Potebnya laid the foundation for the development of this direction. Their research served to understand the semantic, functional and speech properties of incomplete utterances and utterances. V.V. Vinogradov defined utterances as an independent structural-semantic type of the language system, identifying modality and emotionality as their main features. Later scholars Pospelov, Shvedova, Bondarko, Babaytseva, and others further developed this issue in structural-semantic and functional-communicative directions. In general,

it was proved that utterances, incomplete sentences, are an important linguistic phenomenon not only as grammatical, but also as communicative-pragmatic units.

Russian linguist N.S. Kovalev developed a model of the functional-semantic field of the word-speech category.

This functional-semantic model shows that the word-speech category (center) has four main peripheral zones. These zones take into account the cases of switching between complete sentences with words, ellipsis constructions, phraseologisms, and non-verbal-graphic elements in virtual communication. The switching zone between the classes of complete and incomplete sentences with words is the most vivid example of the principle of dynamic balance between modality and information. Because in this case, as can be seen in various variants such as *Rahmat*, the structural and communicative-functional fields are opposed to each other. For example, *Otajon!* or *Advokaaat!..* (a popular Internet meme), are interpreted as phrases from the point of view of the principle of dynamic equilibrium, based on certain communicative-pragmatic signs. The difference in the firing zone between phrases and phraseologisms is that phraseologisms are characterized by stability, while phrases are characterized by individual persistence. This situation depends on the personal speech characteristics of the language user, the communicative task and the relationship with the addressee. Therefore, the problem of structural-semantic similarity creates a firing zone between these two levels. For example, emotional changes such as *Happy path!* instead of *Happy path!* reduce informativeness. Thus, the structural criterion affecting the expression of modality is the cases of changing or excluding components in the structure of a previously stable expression. Kovalev It has been proven that the impact of virtual communication on written and oral speech significantly affects the persistence of phrases. For example, the graphemic sign *facepalm* has become the Russian word "фэйспалм". [6, P.24]

This phenomenon has been widely analyzed by Russian and German linguists such as O.I.Moskal'skaya, E.I.Shendels, V.V.Vinogradov, A.T.Krivososov, G.Helbig, Y.Bush, U.Engel and O.V.Prussova. In particular, Prussova considered words and phrases as separate word classes and organized their semantic and functional properties on a systematic basis.

According to O.V. Prussova, phrases are a special word class that includes constituents expressed by modal words and exclamations at the paradigmatic level. They differ from other word classes by the following features:

- a) have an invariable form (do not have morphological changes);
- b) have communicative completeness;
- c) express the meaning of modality;
- g) do not have a nominative (naming) function;
- d) perform a substitution function;
- e) relate not to a separate word, but to the whole sentence;
- j) are checked only by a yes/no question;
- z) in some cases they can be followed by a negative charge.

O.V. Prussova notes that phrases are multi-semantic. Their content changes depending on the speaker's intention, emotional state, and the pragmatic situation in the context. Therefore, phrases are considered as syncretic (combining several layers of meaning) units. They show

common features both with other equivalent words in their class and with other lexical classes (for example, modal particles, exclamations, verbs).

O.V. Prussova continues her opinion that phrases are not a closed system, their composition expands during the development of the language due to new units. At the syntagmatic level, various word classes (nouns, verbs, adverbs, pronouns, conjunctions, particles) can be attributed to the phrase class.

For example, such units as Boldi!, Yetar!, Tohta!, Ajoyib! originally belonged to another class, but acquired the status of a phrase due to their communicative independence.

Also, phraseologisms (Stop it!, No more!), derivative exclamations, and stable expressions enrich the composition of words. Therefore, this class is considered open. [5,P.179]

One of the scientists who has most thoroughly covered the issue of incomplete sentences from a grammatical perspective is N.I. Grech. He not only gives a definition of incomplete sentences, but also systematically classifies cases of omission (ellipsis) of parts of a sentence. A more detailed analysis of incomplete sentences was initiated by A.M. Peshkovsky. He was the first to develop a theory of incomplete sentences based on grammatical relations between words. According to Peshkovsky, incomplete sentences are sentences in which one or more parts are missing. Accordingly, he distinguishes the following six types of incomplete sentences depending on the type of missing part:

1. sentences that lack a possessive;
2. sentences that lack a participle;
3. sentences that have a predicative part but no conjunction (part of the participle);
4. sentences that have a conjunction but no predicative part;
5. sentences that have a governing verb but no noun or infinitive;
6. sentences that have an adjective relative to the noun but no participle of the noun being defined.

A.M. Peshkovsky emphasizes that incomplete sentences captivate us with their merits and, using this convenient term, considers all sentences that do not meet the principle of verbality to be incomplete. [5, p.100]

An important stage in the development of the theory of incomplete sentences was A.A. Shakhmatov's work *The Syntax of the Russian Language* (1941). In his study, the scientist distinguishes a single-component sentence as a separate type and analyzes its types. In his opinion, single-component sentences (definite personal, indefinite personal, imperative, and imperative sentences) are complete sentences. A.A. Shakhmatov, like Peshkovsky, recognizes intonation as a grammatical factor. Relying on a large linguistic material, he seeks to distinguish the concepts of single-component and incompleteness. However, he analyzed incompleteness in connection with the classification of complete sentences with more than two components or one component, which did not always justify itself [8.P.128]. In addition, he did not consider the issue of incompleteness of a sentence, that is, the omission of secondary elements that are necessary in terms of meaning and structure.

A.P. Skovorodnikov noted the multiplicity of the term incomplete sentence (elliptical sentence) as early as the 1970s, calling this situation the crisis of the theory of ellipsis [7, p. 114]. In his

famous article On the Criterion of Ellipsis in Russian Syntax, he analyzed various approaches to the criterion of incompleteness and substantiated the complex nature of this criterion.

DISCUSSION

In English linguistics, interjections have been given different definitions and there has always been disagreement among scholars about their definition. Some linguists consider interjections to be linguistic units, while another group interprets them only as units that express a state of mind, express emotions, but do not have the status of words. Some researchers have also evaluated interjections as paralinguistic units.

According to J. G. Heder, human and animal sounds expressing exclamations are equal, and both are considered emotional languages. This is a law of nature.[9,P.88] However, this idea is limited in that it does not take into account the social, cultural and communicative features of exclamations. Their formation in the language system, their place in the language and even their participation in the process of word formation (as observed below in Ameka and Wilkins) do not fully encompass Heder's concept of naturalness.

Linguists F. Ameka and D. Wilkins in their work Exclamations note another important feature of exclamations: exclamations also participate in the process of word formation in some languages. That is, they can be combined with other morphemes and become new word groups. For example: **Wow!** (I am amazed) can become a verb: She wowed them during the talk or You should wow them at the interview. This is done through zero conversion.

Yum! Exclamations like "I liked it" or "Yuck!" can be transformed into adjectives by adding adverbs.: This is yummy or That is a yuckie thing.

F. Ameka makes the following conclusion about the functional properties of interjections: Interjections, when viewed from a pragmatic point of view, are a group of units that reveal the communicative relations and goals of communication, and are oriented to the situation and situation. This approach shows interjections not as emotional sounds outside the language, but as grammatically and semantically active language elements. Therefore, the view of Ameka and Wilkins, in contrast to Heder's concept of natural sounds, falls within the framework of pragmatic theory integrated into the language system. Thus, while J.G. Heder's concept of interpreting interjections as natural sounds defines them as units at the paralinguistic level, outside the language, the approach of Ameka and Wilkins shows interjections as systematized, semantically and pragmatically active language elements. These opposing positions express a theoretical difference in determining the place and function of interjections in linguistics.

The authors of the work Grammar of the English Language also emphasize that exclamatory words are units that cannot form syntactic connections and express pure emotions.

As noted in R. Jakobson's work Language in Literature, exclamatory words (interjections) represent the purely emotional layer of the language.

They differ from referential (meaning, content-expressing) language means by two features:

1. in terms of sound structure, they have unique, sometimes not found in other places, sound sequences;
2. in terms of syntactic role, they are not part of a sentence, but are units equivalent to a sentence.

For example: tut! tut! said McGinty (from Conan Doyle's work). The entire speech of this character consists of two aspirated sounds, that is, he speaks only with the help of exclamations. The emotional function of language, which is clearly manifested in exclamations, in fact, to a certain extent enriches or colors all our speech at the sound, grammatical and lexical levels. According to R. Jakobson's theory, exclamatory words (interjections) are language units, that is, they are a component of the language system. Because they perform a certain function in human speech - an emotional (emotional) function. Jakobson distinguishes exclamations from referential (content-denoting) units, but does not exclude them from the language system. [4,P.66-67]

Interjections are a word group whose existence has been recognized since ancient grammars, but they have been almost ignored in most grammatical descriptions. This is because they are considered not a central part of the grammatical system, not a part of langue (language system), but of parole (speech). For example, Quirk et al. (1972), Bonfante (1968), and Fideholtz (1979) have noted that interjections often contain sounds that are not found in other words in the language. Based on these facts, Quirk et al. have concluded:

This observation is not without reason in determining the general status of interjections. Although they are meaningful, they are not integrated into the grammatical structure and lexicon of the language.

However, some studies emphasize that interjections have a specific organized place within the sentence. For example, units that James calls sentence internal interjections can only refer to certain syntactic components and, if there is a boundary break within the sentence, prevent the acceptance of the referent.

Interjection analysis has received new attention within discourse analysis because many interjections function as discourse markers. Schiffrin defines markers as ordinally related elements that delimit discourse units. Their task is to define speech in terms of contextual factors such as the relationship between participants, the importance of the topic, or its connection with the previous text." [6, P.1291]

While traditional linguists (Quirk, Bonfante, Fideholtz) consider exclamations to be speech units outside the grammatical system, modern researchers (James, Schiffrin) also recognize them as language units, justifying their place in discourse and syntactic structures.

Although an independent grammatical category of utterances had not yet been formed, scientists of that time paid special attention to their semantic and functional aspects (Lomonosov, Vostokov, Buslaev, etc.). At the same time, researchers such as Saussure, Potebnya, Fortunatov, Gretch interpreted these units as unlimited syntagmas or incomplete sentences.

According to the linguist Kovalev, utterances are understood as context-dependent, indivisible syntactic units. They are characterized by modality and performs a communicative function. In modern Russian, words and expressions expressing such meanings as agreement/disagreement, acceptance/refusal, greeting/farewell, gratitude/nomination, surprise/anger, joy/despair, understanding/misunderstanding, action/apathy, etc. are actively used. Kovalev distinguishes between general linguistic and specific factors that complicate the analysis of the category of words and expressions.

Among them are:

the variability of language over time,

the relationship between oral and written language,

the new space of communication created as a result of Internet communication,
the syntactic status of words and phrases,
the relationship of these units with other phenomena (phraseologisms, onomatopoeias, vocatives),
the lack of a unified terminology,
the individual and anthropocentric nature of words and phrases.

N.S. Kovalev interprets words and phrases as indivisible syntactic units that are context-dependent, characterized by modality and perform a communicative function. Their analysis is complicated by factors such as the variability of language, Internet communication, the uncertainty of syntactic status, and their relationship with phraseologisms and onomatopoeias.

The most detailed grammatical instruction on incomplete sentences was developed by N. I. Grech. Grech not only gives a description of incomplete sentences, but also classifies cases of omission (ellipsis) of parts of a sentence.

The instruction on ellipsis or the omission of parts of a sentence was later developed in P. M. Pervlessky's Outlines of Russian Syntax. However, since this instruction was given in an overly rationalized form, it could not have a significant impact on subsequent grammars.

According to P.M. Pervlessky, only subordinate clauses can be omitted.

He defines the concept of subordinate not on the basis of grammatical connection, but on the basis of meaning (semantic) or even etymological grounds.

The most valuable words in P.M. Pervlessky's concept are not omitted, as if they carry the main semantic load.

He defines ellipsis as follows:

“Ellipsis is the omission of parts of a sentence that are necessary for the grammatical completeness of speech, but not for understanding its content.[6,P.5]

RESULTS

According to T. V. Benfey, there is a sufficient difference between interjections and words. However, interjections were later isolated as a separate word class that cannot be divided into other small units and recognized as an independent unit in the language system. [5,P.70]

N.S. Kovalev identified specific transformational properties of speech units, for which isomorphism associated with the presence of a single-word plural speech unit is characteristic. According to him, there are derivational, expansionary (distributive), non-verbal and combined transformations of speech units.

Types of transformations of speech units:

Derivational transformation: occurs through morphological changes (for example, Spasibo Spasibiце!”).

Expansionary transformation: occurs through the addition of additional components (pronoun, preposition, adverb, interjection, etc.) (“Nichego! – Nichego sebe! – Nu nichego sebe!”).

Nonverbal transformation: meaning is enhanced through intonation, facial expressions, and gestures.

Combined transformation occurs as a result of the combination of derivational or extensional changes with nonverbal means and affects the semantic content of the utterance (Uyekhal! Gogol).

If T. V. Benfey distinguished interjections from words and recognized them as an independent category, then in the studies of N.S. Kovalev, utterances are interpreted as a developed form of this phenomenon. Interjections have a wider semantic and pragmatic range than interjections, they express not only an emotional reaction, but also cognitive, semantic and pragmatic content.

A.M. Peshkovsky writes: although incomplete sentences are more common in oral speech than complete sentences, in the mind they are equated with complete sentences. However, I.A. Popova, the scientist who initiated the discussion on this issue, holds a different opinion and says that incomplete sentences cannot be equated with complete sentences. She notes that sometimes it is neither necessary nor possible to add parts of a sentence, since such an addition changes the semantics of the sentence. Later, in a number of studies, this idea was developed, and many structurally incomplete sentences were considered as complete sentences in content.

P.A. According to Lekant, in monologic, especially dialogic, speech, incomplete sentences often prevail over complete sentences [4, P.462465].

Conclusion

The analysis of the research of foreign and Russian linguists shows that utterances and incomplete sentences are unique, multifaceted phenomena of the language system. If foreign scholars (E. Sapir, L. Bloomfield, R. Trask, F. Ameka, etc.) considered them mainly as exclamatory units expressing an emotional reaction, then Russian linguists (A.A. Shakhmatov, V.V. Vinogradov, G.A. Zolotova, O.V. Prussova, N.S. Kovalev, etc.) have determined the grammatical, semantic and communicative-pragmatic nature of these units, their independent function in speech and stylistic value.

Also, according to Russian linguists, utterances are not only a means of emotional expression, but also an active means of concise and expressive transmission of thought. They play an important role in expressing a person's emotional and psychological state, attitude and reaction in communication during speech. Therefore, in modern linguistics, sayings are recognized as a dynamic, open phenomenon of language, closely related to the human factor.

References :

1. Bloomfield L. Language. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984. (1933). <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/11576293/language-bloomfield-leonard-1887-1949-pdf-rare-books-at>
2. Warton T. Pragmatics and no-verbal communication. – Cambridge University Press, 2009. – P.70. www.cambridge.org.
- Jakobson, R. Linguistics and poetics: in Style in language. Edited by T. Sebeok. – Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960. 1960. – P. 66-67.
3. Виноградов В.В. : Вопросы синтаксиса современного русского языка. М., 1950. С.38.
4. Ковалев Н.С. Особенности выявления «оценочности» в словах-предложениях и близких к ним по значению конструкциях // Известия Чеченского государственного педагогического института. – 2016. – Т. 9. – № 2 (14). –С. 74-79.

5. Лекант П. А. Современный русский язык (под ред. П. А. Леканта). – Москва: Дрофа, 2002. – С. 462-465.
6. Montes R.G. The development of discourse markers in Spanish: Interjections // Journal of Pragmatics 1999. – № 31. – P. 1289–1319.
7. А. М. Пешковский. Сборник статей, Госиздат, Л., 1925, стр. 100.
8. Прусова О.В. Слова-предложения в современном немецком языке: диссертация ... кандидата филологических наук: 10.02.04.- Нижний Новгород, 2001.- 223 с.: ил. РГБ ОД, 61 01-10/872-0. –С. 179.
9. Попова И.А. Неполные предложения в совр.рус. яз.// Труды Института языкознания, т.2.М.,1953.[Электронный ресурс] - Режим доступа: <http://www.russofile.ru.C.5>
10. Sapir E. Language. – New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1921. <https://www.ugr.es/>
11. Сковородников А.П. О критерии эллиптичности в русском синтаксисе // Вопросы языкознания. 1973. №3. - С. 114-123
12. Trask, R.L. A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics. – London. Routledge, 1993.
13. O'Connell D.C., Kowal S., King S.P. Interjections in literary readings and artistic performance. Pragmatics, 17. International Pragmatics Association, 2007. – P. 420.
14. Шахматов А.А. Синтаксис русского языка. Л., 1941.
15. Herder J.G. On the origin of language. In On the origin of language: Two essays. Translated by J.H.Moran, A. Gode. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London, 1966. – P. 88.