Nodira ARTIKOVA,
Teacher of the department of English Philology
Samarkand state institute of foreign languages
E-mail: nodira202007@gmail.com

Based on the review of SamSIFL, PhD. Associate professor, R.M.Asadov

THE ROLE OF DIALOGIC DISCOURSE IN THE FORMATION OF INCOMPLETE SENTENCES
Annotation

This article gives information about theories and the role of dialogue in discourse and the formation of incomplete statements as well as pointing the categories of incomplete sentences and its types. In addition, it provides feasible notions from the prominent linguist who clearly discover all complex questions.
Key words: *dialogue, method, interpretation, elliptical form, colloquial speech, incomplete sentence, categories.*

TO'LIQSIZ GAPLARNI SHAKLLANTIRISHDA DIALOGIK NUTQNING ROLI
Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada diskurs va to'liqsiz gaplarni shakllantirishda dialogning nazariyalari hamda roli haqida ma'lumot berilgan, shuningdek to'liq bo'lmagan gaplarning kategoriyalari va ularning turlari ko'rsatilgan. Bundan tashqari, maqola barcha murakkab masalalarni aniq ochib beradigan taniqli tilshunosning asosli g'oyalarini taqdim etadi.
Kalit so'zlar: *dialog, usul, talqin, elliptik shakl, og'zaki nutq, to'liqsiz gap, kategoriyalar.*

РОЛЬ ДИАЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ НЕПОЛНЫХ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЙ
Аннотация

В этой статье дается информация о теориях и роли диалога в дискурсе и формировании неполных высказываний, а также указываются категории неполных предложений и их типы. Кроме того, в ней приводятся обоснованные идеи выдающегося лингвиста, который четко раскрывает все сложные вопросы.
Ключевые слова: *диалог, метод, интерпретация, эллиптическая форма, разговорная речь, незаконченное предложение, категории.*

Introduction. It is common knowledge that language facilitates spoken and written communication between people as well as the exchange of ideas and understanding. Dialogue or dialogic discourse can exhibit these types. Study on the syntactic structure of dialogical speech has been extensively conducted recently.

As O. Jespersen points out, dialogue is a complicated, multidimensional phenomena rather than a straightforward method of information sharing and communication. Scientific interpretation is multifaceted and cannot be reduced to analyzing its structural and semantic components. The conversation is mostly made up of many types of dialogical units, where an utterance is the other person's spoken response to anything. Dialogue is defined as a statement-generating exchange between people during a discussion [1].

However, from the perspective of syntactic semantics, they did not provide a thorough analysis of the patterns of interaction of dialogical question-and-answer replicas, and specifically, the clearly non-expressed aspects in the structure of incomplete sentences in response replicas [2].

Literature review. Dialogic speech, according to E.M. Rosenbaum, "means the speech of more than one person as a type of speech, as opposed to monologue". The antithesis of a monologue, a dialogue is the result of two persons engaging in a discussion" [3]. One of the most popular types of oral communication is conversational speaking. A dialogue consists of a series of remarks that are made by two or more people during a discussion. Sentences that transition smoothly into dialogical speech with quickly shifting copies and without words whose meaning is obvious from the previous are the most specific for dialogue. The most dissimilar form of dialogic discourse is this one [4].

Research methodology. In general, dialogue is a universal, general linguistic phenomenon with many facets, and its scientific interpretation cannot be restricted to taking into account its syntactic and structural aspects because current syntactic analysis techniques do not allow us to fully reveal the mechanism underlying the creation of statements within the dialogical unity's bounds.

Analysis and results. According to studies on dialogic unity from the perspective of communicative grammar, question-and-answer dialogue is the primary mode of dialogic communication. Its "penetration" into the structure of other syntactic formulations in the conversation under investigation serves as another illustration of this [5].

According to E.A. Trafimova, the study of dialogic speech "allows us to identify the main means of expressing interrelationships in a number of languages." The elliptical form of the copies themselves, along with their intonation and vocabulary - grammatical indicators - are the most widely used methods of identifying them in speech flows" [6].

Stated differently, dialogic colloquial speech primarily uses unfinished sentences. However, according to O.B. Sirotinina, "the dialogical nature and situational nature of communication determine the incompleteness of spoken sentences" [7] are the primary causes of the erasure of linguistic disparities.

Linguists use many criteria to categorize incomplete sentences. In any event, when categorizing incomplete sentences, it would appear more acceptable to consider the kind and degree of semantic incompleteness as well as, most importantly, the grammatical characteristics of the given verbal composition. This approach is far from ideal though, as we still have to rely on a comparison with conditionally full phrases in certain situations.

M.Z. Zakiev distinguishes between three primary categories of incomplete sentences by considering the rationale for the omission of particular components. 1) Situational; 2) Phrasologized incomplete phrases; and 3) Contextual [8]. Regarding the first two categories, where the unexpressed components are explained either by the speech situation or by the context, one can concur with the researcher. Completely phraseologized incomplete phrases are quite uncommon. Say, "Happy holidays!" as an example. Salutations for the afternoon! Phonological analysis rather than syntactic analysis is used to characterize and distinguish them from regular incomplete sentences. Only the elements that could be absent from sentences should be indicated by the

syntax, together with the syntactic criteria that correspond to each insufficiency. However, what about phrases that end in "Good afternoon!" or "Good way!" I.A. Popova states: "Almost all sentences of this type are stable phraseological combinations, as such do not need any additions and should be considered as complete sentences of the modern Russian language, even if they were elliptical in genetic terms" [9]. Furthermore, it appears that the following two clauses are crucial to the evolution of the incomplete proposal debate: The degree and type of incompleteness in a sentence should be taken into consideration rather than formal grammatical indicators like the absence of a controlled or defined word. Incomplete sentences are unique living structural types of utterance of a colloquial, primarily dialogical form of speech, which cannot be considered as a violation of the norms of complete sentences of book–literary, monological speech and which themselves are subject to study from the side of their own specific properties [9].

Using materials from the Russian language's XVII century, Z.A. Ledeneva classifies the following phrases as incomplete:

Elliptical sentences with an unnamed verb of being;
Elliptical sentences with an unnamed verb of motion;
Elliptical sentences with speech omission;
Elliptical sentences with an unnamed action verb;
Elliptical sentences with omission of the verb included in the phraseological unit [10].

The author's categorization is incomplete since it only takes into account one kind of unfinished sentence.

Taking into consideration the kind of speech and the rationale for element omission, four categories of incomplete sentences are distinguished by other Russian language grammar writers: Complete assertions that are 1) situational; 2) contextual; 3) elliptical; and 4) dialogic [11].

The authors suggest the following explanation for the elliptical type: "Elliptical are incomplete sentences in which the predicate is omitted, but there are circumstances or additions that the predicate explains in complete sentences". [11] Since this sort of incomplete sentence is eventually used in dialogic and monologue speech, as well as in certain situations or settings, it is debatable whether it is necessary to designate a third type of incomplete sentences. The writers differentiate the last category of unfinished sentences according to the speech genre. It is crucial to note that the writers' perspective does not extend to monological incomplete phrases. As far as we are aware, incomplete sentences are those whose structure lacks an externally communicated element that may be explained by a circumstance or context in either dialogical or monological discourse.

O.I. Moskalskaya distinguishes between three primary categories of incomplete sentences from the perspective of semantics: a) deterministic sentences, where the predicate defines the subject; b) relational sentences, where the predicate establishes relations between objects; and c) existential sentences, which express the presence and existence of the subject [12]. It should be mentioned that incomplete sentences can be categorized based on their syntactic and semantic properties. The structural formality of semantic incomplete sentences is different from that of syntactic ones. It is not necessary to delete syntactic pieces; leaving out any part does not change the meaning in a structural or semantic sense. However, we define syntactic incompleteness of sentences to be the ability to replace or fill in the whole sentence.

When separating incomplete sentences, Z.I. Budagova makes two suggestions based on which she distinguishes between two groups based on their structure and semantics. First, there are incomplete sentences whose omitted parts can be recovered from earlier sentences; these are referred to as "contextual incomplete sentences"; second, there are incomplete sentences whose omitted parts are inferred from the statement's overall meaning; these are referred to as "elliptical incomplete sentences" [13].

The latter type of incomplete sentences cannot convince us to call them elliptical sentences in any way. Since ellipticity and incompleteness of sentences are understood by us in cases of omission or omission of an element in the structure of sentences. Based on the material of the modern Uzbek language, A.Babayeva divides incomplete sentences into four groups:

Contextual incomplete sentences;
Situational incomplete sentences;
Elliptical incomplete sentences;
Incomplete sentences in dialogic speech [14].

A.Babaeva calls elliptical those sentences where the verb predicate is explicitly unexpressed. But this type is also one of the types of incomplete sentences.

In the study of interrogative incomplete sentences of dialogical speech, S.S.Berkner divides them into the following types: 1)situational; 2) contextual; 3) monomial interrogative incomplete sentences aimed at clarifying the state; 4) incomplete interrogative sentences consisting of a subject and another member; 5) incomplete interrogative sentences expressed by subject and minor members; 6) incomplete interrogative sentences consisting of negation not + predicative or complement; 7) incomplete monomial interrogatives expressed by a verb; 8) incomplete interrogative sentences expressed by the significant part of the predicate + minor terms; 9) incomplete interrogative sentences caused by the previous message and representing the addition of circumstances, additions, definitions and predicatives; 10) incomplete interrogative sentences of the cause; 11) incomplete interrogative sentences naming actions or states; 12) contextual monomial interrogative sentences expressed by interrogative adverbs and pronouns; 13) incomplete interrogative sentences of a clarifying nature; 14) incomplete interrogative sentences expressed by the combination of what (how) about + pronoun or noun; 15) incomplete interrogative sentences expressed by subordinate clauses [15].

Conclusion. As can be seen, in this classification, incomplete interrogative sentences are not limited to language levels, i.e. the morphological level is mixed with the syntactic or vice versa, and the syntactic concept is also mixed with the conceptual category. At the same time, it should be noted that the classification of interrogative incomplete sentences is carried out on the basis of the existing terms, which is very indicative.

LITERATURE

1. Jespersen O.A Modem English Grammar on Historical Principles. - Copenhagen 1954. - P. IV, -Vol.5. – P. 44(452) p.
2. Винокур Т.Г. О некоторых синтаксических особенностях диалогической речи // Исследования по грамматике русского литературного языка. - - М.: ЖАНР, 1955.-С. 342-355
3. Розенбаум Е.М. Некоторые итоги смыслового анализа диалога. Сб.: Теория и практика лингвистического описания разговорной речи, Горький, 1968, С. 34.(34-37)

4. Валимова Г.В. Об основных типах ответных предложений диалогической речи // - Учен.запис, юбилейный сборник (к 25-летию Ростовского Госпединститута), Ростов, 1955, С. 160.
5. Гаврильев Н.Н. семантико-синтаксические особенности диалога и их стилистическое использование. Автореф.дисс… канд.филол.наук, - М., 1974. С. 6. (27)
6. Трофимова Э.А. Синтаксические конструкции в английской разговорной речи. Изд-во Ростов. Ун-та, 1981. С. 80.
7. Сиротинина О.Б. Устная речь типы речевых культур //Русистика сегодня. 1995. №4. С.(17–27) 12.
8. Закиев М.З. Вопрос о полном и неполном предложении в татарском языке // Татар телендэ тулы хам кем жомле мэсэлэсе. - № 2 - Уфа: Совет мэктэбэ, 1958. - С. 3-11.
9. Попова И.А Неполные предложения в современном русском языке. – Труды института языкознания, т. 11., М., 1953, С. 138.
10. Леденева, З.А. Эллиптические предложения в русском языке XVII век. Грамматика русского языка, вып.1. - Иркутск, пед. ин-т., 1972. - С. 61-69.
11. Современный русский язык, Ташкент, 1977, 108
12. Москальская О.И. Проблемы системного описания синтаксиса. - М.: Высш, школа, 1974. – (156) С 80-88.
13. Будагова З.И. Эллиптические предложения в современном азербайджанском языке. № 5. - Баку: Советская тюркология, 1972. - С. (10-16) 12.
14. Бабаева А. Ҳозирги замон узбек адабий тилида тўлиқсиз гаплар.- - Ташкент: Фан, 1978. – (108) Б. 32.
15. Беркнер С.С. Некоторые синтаксические особенности вопросных реплик английской диалогической речи. – В кн.: Учен.запис. Ульяновского ун-та, Т.26, вып.1. 1958, С. 59-61.