



INCOMPLETE SYNTACTIC CONSTRUCTIONS IN COGNITIVE-DISCURSIVE INFORMATION AND ISOFUNCTIONAL ASPECTS

Burieva Umida Abdumuminovna
*National University of Uzbekistan, Doctorate student of comparative
Linguistics department.*

ANNOTATION

In this article, incomplete syntactic constructions are considered in line with the latest linguistic approaches the study is carried out in the framework of a cognitive-discursive paradigm using informational and isofunctional approaches, an attempt is made of an explanatory approach. The data of philosophy, psychology, psycholinguistics, cognitiology, information theory are attracted, which is relevant for the modern inter subject paradigm of linguistics.

KEY WORDS: *incompleteness, ellipsis, discourse, isofunctional, information gap, extralinguistic, lacuna.*

Аннотация

*В статье рассматриваются неполные синтаксические конструкции в русле новейших лингвистических подходов исследование проводится в рамках когнитивно-дискурсивной парадигмы с использованием информационного и изофункционального подходов, предпринимается попытка объяснительного подхода. Привлекаются данные философии, психологии, психолингвистики, когнитологии, теории информации что для современной межпредметной парадигмы лингвистики является актуальным. **Ключевые слова:** неполнота, эллипсис, дискурс, изо функциональность, информационный разрыв, экстралингвистика, лакуна.*

DISCUSSION

The problems of compressing the plan of expression in incomplete constructions and the successful functioning of “*concise*” statements in the discourse are in the focus of attention of modern scientists - their solution would allow to obtain fundamentally new data on methods of encoding language information. Syntactic incompleteness refers to the most frequent phenomena of everyday discourse, and its description, taking into account various kinds of factors, is especially relevant. According to P.A. Lekant, the distinction between complete and incomplete sentences is very important for linguistic

theory and educational practice. The need for a multidimensional study of incomplete syntactic constructions is stated by many other researchers [1].

The data of modern syntactic theories allow us to illuminate in a new way such difficult issues as the composition, status and functioning of incomplete sentences in modern Russian. In our opinion, attempts to limit the list of incomplete constructions, differentiate different types of incompleteness, which were earlier undertaken, have insufficient explanatory power because researchers searched for incompleteness mechanisms at the level of syntactic and semantic structures, incompleteness was not considered as a systemic phenomenon functioning at



different levels language from cognition to discourse[2].

Among the central questions of the theory of incompleteness are its criteria. With traditional approaches to the study of the described phenomenon, the following criteria are among the main criteria:

- 1) the syntactic role of the omitted member or members of the sentence;
- 2) the specifics of the available composition, i.e. verbally represented members of the proposal;
- 3) consideration of the situation and context;
- 4) taking into account the syntactic position of the omitted component;
- 5) accounting for the semantic position of the non-verbalized component. All available classifications mainly follow the principle of minimalism strive to highlight the minimum number of criteria for incompleteness. The result of this approach is the unlawful narrowing of the boundaries of the phenomenon of syntactic incompleteness in which it is delimited from a number of "related" phenomena, primarily from ellipsis and from semantic incompleteness[3]. Moreover, the distinction between semantic and syntactic incompleteness in almost all studies is based on the principle of opposition.

In our understanding, semantic incompleteness is not opposed to syntactic. Semantic incompleteness is the presence of a gap in the cognitive structure of the utterance

eg: He remembered something, while syntactic incompleteness is the presence of an unsubstituted syntactic position, which is mandatory for recovery based on internal information contained in the structure itself or external information contained in the discourse (context) *eg: Anton bought the ball, and Pavel bought chess*. At the same time an incomplete offer is isofunctional to the corresponding full one *eg: ..and Pavel acquired chess*[4]. An incomplete sentence system is a combination of isofunctional structures with varying degrees of explicitness of components. An incomplete sentence representing a unit of information does not represent the whole in a communicative act, but only a fragment of his image of the world that is essential for the speaker - the main actual proposition in a minimal explicit predicative design.

In most cases, complete isofunctional variants of incomplete syntactic constructions are easily transformed into structures in which one of the components actualizes non-essential and the second - actual, preferred information. Thus, the isofunctional invariant of a potentially incomplete sentence can be a complete sentence and even a poly propositive full sentence, in which an entire proposition can be omitted when incompleteness is formed. The

cognitive structure of the utterance is at the deepest level of the linguistic system and only as a result of the processes of nomination, predication and verbalization takes on structurally-semantic outlines. As a result of these processes a random or intentional "loss" of a fragment of cognitive information may occur, which will affect the semantic and or syntactic structure of the statement[5].

We call such a "loss" an information gap. Its nature and place of origin are directly related to which of the types of incompleteness is realized at the place of formation of this gap. An essential point is the importance or relevance for the communication of information that "fell" into the gap. If this information affects a fragment of the picture of the world that is irrelevant for the given discourse, uncritical for the reconstruction of the necessary knowledge, then most likely neither the one who makes the statement, nor the one to whom it is addressed, will notice the absence of this information. If the information is of an additional, commenting nature then it if it turns out to be significant in the process of deploying the discourse is represented in a connecting or parcel design (depending on when its relevance appears). Moreover, the absence of an informational fragment of the proposition does not mean its destruction, even if a significant part is lost. As long as reconstruction of the proposition is possible we can talk about the *information gap*[7].

If the information gap is observed at the stage of formation of the cognitive structure of the utterance is a loss of the information component even before the construction of the syntactic structure it can be assumed that such a loss will not affect the syntactic structure (which, when formed, compensates for the shortage) and remains in the semantics of the statement. If the information gap is manifested at the stage of formation of the verbal-grammatical structure and at the stage of formation of the cognitive structure of the utterance of the gap then such a gap is represented at the level of the syntactic structure. A situation is possible where relevant information "falls out" of the cognitive structure and its "lack" is felt both at the level of the structure (the gap is represented in the syntax) and at the level of semantics. Hence we can conclude that the two types of incompleteness are directly related to the stage at which the cognitive transformation of a fragment of the picture of the world into a statement reveals a gap: on the preverbal or on the verbal-syntactic.

Two types of information gap are distinguished in the article

a) in the presence of a gap in the cognitive structure, semantic incompleteness is formed on its basis



b) if there is a gap in the discursive structure (and its absence in the cognitive structure) - syntactic incompleteness is formed on the basis of this phenomenon.

The following reasons for the formation of the information gap are revealed:

- 1) Time saving: the speaker wants the statement to be shorter (time of utterance)
- 2) Volume saving: the speaker seeks to make the statement as compact as possible
- 3) The presence of precedential conventional models: there are a large number of typical models for deploying discourse that are of a precedential nature and can form the basis of various variations:

For example

- How are you? - Fine.

- And you?

A typical dialogue, which is common when two friends meet. His cues, according to the customary tradition, do not provide for the deployment of one of the phrases to the full syntactic version.

- 4) The absence of the need for a representation of the syntactic component - this formal factor occurs in most cases when all the necessary semantics of the component are already expressed by other components of the statement: *Everything in the garden!*

The imperativeness and the presence of the circumstances of the place, as well as the third syntactic person give enough information that the verb of movement takes place in the statement - the insignificance of how this movement will be carried out allows this verb to be omitted.

- 5) An expression of the insignificance of a given information fragment in comparison with other information - this cognitive plan factor makes it possible to artificially reduce the relevance of a restored but omitted component compared to information that is verbalized.

- 6) The impossibility of verbalization - this factor can be called operational-cognitive: *for example*, for the representation of an information fragment there is no means of expression or it is not found in a timely manner.

- 7) Cohesive factors - by means of a lacunae, a reference is formed to another fragment of discourse, cohesion is formed: there are several informational positions on the same object, itself may be replaced by pronouns or may periodically be omitted, its position remains empty, intended for independent completion by the recipient.

- 8) Stylistic factors that usually act together with cohesive ones to avoid unnecessary repetitions in communication (text). Along with the synonymous substitution, which is more characteristic of written forms of speech, a lacuna in the place of the

previously mentioned object is more often used in colloquial speech.

- 9) Extralinguistic (situational) factors, which are based on a direct reference to the objects of extralinguistic reality: *This is yours. Where's mine ?*

- 10) an important factor is the inferiority of the position of the omitted component. This is especially pronounced in the case of omission of communication means representing the logical position: *you buy now - there will be no money left - (If) you buy (this) now, (then) there will be no money left*[8].

The lacuna in the syntactic structure obeys the general rules of information theory, it can be:

a) replenished or irreplaceable;

b) critical or non-critical to maintain the information integrity of the message.

The possible number of combinations of these parameters is four and in accordance with the distribution of these signs four degrees of syntactic incompleteness can be distinguished by the nature of the information gap:

- 1) replaceable, uncritical — elliptic constructions of the 2nd person equal to them in status, definitive constructions of the 2nd person, definitely personal and etc. The cognitive completion procedure in these cases is minimal information deficiency is compensated for by the information contained within the construct itself, RAM functions within the structure stored in it.
- 2) replaceable, critical - cases of incompleteness, amenable to reconstruction (most structures traditionally distinguished as incomplete). The cognitive replenishment procedure in this case is characterized by a greater or lesser degree of volumetricity and is quite effective, information is being reconstructed, various types of memory are functioning from short-term to store the immediate context and current discourse to long-term, including a knowledge base about the world and its laws.
- 3) irreplaceable, uncritical cases of discursive use of structures with gaps that do not affect the integrity of the discourse: *I saw here ... - What did you see? - No, I forgot that* Often in this situation deictic filling of the gap occurs: *- I forgot this ... - What did I forget? - It doesn't matter*

The cognitive replenishment procedure in this case is characterized by low efficiency there is a substitution of the most likely missing information; memory access does not produce the expected effect.



- 4) irreplaceable, critical - cases of interrupted communication and other communicative failures associated with the irreplaceable lack of the necessary component I just heard: **“Guys, they are here ...”** - and the connection disappeared.

The cognitive replenishment procedure in this case again becomes minimal there is no data memory access is inefficient, a partial effect is achieved as a result of modeling one or several possible options while the result is considered unsatisfactory, there is not enough information with the simulated fragment of the picture of the world remains unreliable and incomplete.

Since all these phenomena are characterized by one mechanism of formation and functioning they should be qualified as cases of syntactic incompleteness.

Thus, the two levels of formation of the information gap create two types of incompleteness (semantic and syntactic) but these two types of incompleteness are not opposed to each other, but are only different in origin and functioning. In addition, it follows that the spectrum of manifestations of syntactic incompleteness is continuous and covers the entire syntactic system of the language.

REFERENCES

1. Kargina, I.M. *Incomplete proposal in the information-discursive aspect* / I.M. Kargina // *Bulletin of the Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University*. - 2010. - No 4. - P. 131–134 (0.9 bp).
2. Kargina, I.M. *Classification criteria for incomplete syntactic constructions [Electronic resource]* / I.M. Kargina // *Scientific journal KubSAU*. - 2012. -- No. 77 (03). - URL: <http://ej.kubagro.ru/2012/03/pdf/74.pdf> (1.1 pp.).
3. Kargina, I.M. *Information gap as a factor in the formation of syntactic incompleteness* / I.M. Kargina // *Bulletin of the Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University*. - 2012. - No 1. - P. 21-24 (0.9 bp).
4. Kargina, I.M. *Isofunctional criterion of syntactic incompleteness* / I.M. Kargina // *Linguistic, social, historical-cultural, didactic contexts of the functioning of the Russian language as the state language of the Russian Federation: Sat. materials interregion. conf.* / ed. E.V. Brysina and V.I. Suprun. - Volgograd: Publishing house of TsODOD Olimpia, 2014. - P. 215–222 (0.6 bp).
5. Kargina, I.M. *Typological properties of incomplete structures [Electronic resource]* / I.M. Kargina // *Conference Server at Stavropol State University*. - URL: <http://conf.stavsu.ru/conf.asp?ReportId=2096> (0.3 pp.).
5. Kargina, I.M. *Syntactic incompleteness in a complex sentence* / I.M. Kargina // *Almanac of modern science and education*. - 2011. -- No. 11

(54). - S. 157–160 (0.7 bp).

7. Kargina, I.M. *Structural incompleteness of a component of a complex sentence* / I.M. Kargina // *Materials of the scientific conference of teachers and students of the Moscow State Institute of Physics and Technology (April 2010)*. - Moscow - Stavropol, 2010. - S. 167–171 (0.4 bp).

1. 8. Kargina, I.M. *Context and Conservation in the View of Syntactic Incompleteness* / I.M. Kargina // *Materials of the scientific conference of teachers and students of SSPI*. - Stavropol, 2011. -- S. 211–218 (0.3 bp).