

**PRAGMATIC AND SEMANTIC INTEGRATION OF WORDS AND SENTENCES: THEIR  
RELATIONSHIP TO INCOMPLETE AND SITUATIONAL UNITS IN SPEECH****Ibragimova Muqaddas**

Teacher at SamSIFL Samarkand, Uzbekistan.

**Abstract.** This article analyzes the phenomenon of exclamations and incomplete sentences from the perspective of linguistic research. It is shown that historically, exclamations were considered not as central or main parts of the language, but as peripheral, marginal units. Latin grammarians and linguists of the 19th century considered them to be units independent of syntax, expressing only emotions. E. Sapir also considered exclamations as an ornament for the fabric of the language. T. Wharton notes that these views are also found in modern literature, but conceptual approaches consider exclamations as a part of the language with a rich semantic structure.

The article emphasizes that exclamations are divided into primary and secondary types according to F. Ameka's classification, which is independent of syntax, does not have morphological changes, and also has the property of expressing emotions and performing a socio-signaling function. According to T. Wharton's theory, it is logical to analyze exclamations on the continuum of showing and saying. At the same time, the Relevance Theory approach allows combining exclamations in terms of semantic and social communication.

The article also considers the issue of utterances and incomplete sentences in Russian linguistics. Based on the research of N.S. Valgina, I.A. Popova and A.M. Peshkovsky, incomplete sentences are analyzed as units that, although lacking syntactic parts, form a natural, communicative and dialogical form of speech, the meaning of which is restored through context and situation. It is emphasized that incompleteness is a natural feature of speech communication, and attempts to artificially fill it can disrupt the content and structural structure.

This analysis combines the phenomenon of interjections and incomplete sentences with their semantic, pragmatic, and social aspects, revealing their speech function and illuminating the relationship between the central and marginal parts of language.

**Keywords:** interjections, incomplete sentences, marginal units, semantics, pragmatics, speech communication, Relevance Theory, showing and saying continuum.

**Introduction**

Historically, exclamations were considered not as central or main parts of the language, but as peripheral, marginal (i.e. independent of the main syntax and morphology of the language).

Latin grammarians and linguists of the 19th century considered exclamations as “alienated” units independent of syntax, expressing only emotions or mental states.

. Linguists of the 19th century, on the other hand, considered them paralinguistic, sometimes even non-linguistic phenomena: “There is such a wide gap between the exclamation word and the word that the exclamation word can be called the negation of language” (T. Benfey); “Language begins where exclamations end” (M. Muller); E. Sapir called exclamations “nothing more than an ornament for the vast and complex fabric of language.”

T. Wharton emphasizes that these views are also found in modern literature. For example, R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, et al. define interjections as “words that express only emotions and do not enter into syntactic relations”; L. R. Trask defines them as “a lexical unit or phrase that expresses an emotion and does not usually enter into syntactic structures”; Crystal adds that “an interjection is a word or sound added to a sentence to express an idea.”

Nevertheless, T. Wharton notes that, according to the conceptual approach, exclamations are part of the language and have a rich semantic structure. However, there are exceptions. However, conceptual approachers do not agree on what an exclamation is. F. Ameka divides exclamations into primary and secondary classes. Primary exclamations are used only as exclamations, for example: oops and ouch:

Many consider exclamations to be a paralinguistic element, not a specific part of the language. The reasons for this are:

They are often independent of syntax and do not undergo morphological changes.

They express more emotions or mental states, that is, they perform a socio-signaling function in communication.

In some cases, exclamations occur in a universal or non-linguistic form (ouch, yuk, wow).

According to T. Wharton, taking into account these facts, it is convenient to analyze exclamations on the continuum of showing and saying.

Exclamations sometimes indicate only an emotional state (for example, ouch, yuk), and sometimes convey certain information (for example, hell, shit, an assessment of a certain situation). This continuum sheds light on the differences and interrelationships of different types of exclamations.

As T. Wharton noted, Relevance Theory explains the process of understanding speech through the principle of maximum efficiency in the transmission and reception of information. According to this theory, exclamations can be analyzed in the following ways:

They not only have semantic content, but also fulfill a specific communicative purpose depending on the context.

Exclamations perform communicative functions in speech, such as attracting attention, quickly expressing emotions, or indicating social relationships.

For example, the word ouch, while expressing pain, requires the listener to pay attention and evaluate the situation. Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1986, 1995) is an approach that builds on the basic communication theory developed by Grays (Grice). However, it is based not on Grays's socially oriented maxims, but on a basic principle of human cognition. Humans naturally tend to seek out relevant information that interacts with their existing mental representations and allows them to draw new conclusions.

According to T. Wharton's analysis, Relevance Theory allows us to combine exclamations from the perspective of conceptual and social communication. They answer the questions not only of what is communicated (information content), but also of how it is communicated (how it is transmitted). At the same time, this approach also takes into account the spontaneous and paralinguistic nature of exclamations. Thus, T. Wharton suggests a combined analysis of the semantic, pragmatic and social functions of exclamations.

Over the past century, the issue of incomplete sentences and phrases has repeatedly been the focus of special research. In Russian linguistics, the structural model of a sentence, its structural and semantic completeness or incompleteness, as well as the formation of phrases as independent predicative units have been widely covered. At the same time, the factors influencing the emergence of incomplete and phrases have also been scientifically analyzed.

Studies in this area have been carried out by I.A. Popova (1954), E.M. Galkina-Fedoruk (1959), A.P. Gvozdev (1961), N.S. Valgina, V.V. Babaytseva, O.V. Prussova, A.P. Skovorodnikov (1966), P.A. Lekant (1966), A.L. Faktorovich (1989), A.A. Chuvakin (1973), E.N. Shiryaev (1970), L.V. Lisochenko (1992) and other scientists have widely covered this issue. However, research in this area cannot be considered fully completed, since a number of issues still remain open. In particular, the paradigmatic, syntagmatic and semantic properties of incomplete sentences and utterances, their paradigmatic potential, and the specific aspects of their “behavior” in discourse and text still require in-depth analysis.

According to the Russian linguist N.S. Valgina, a special group in the structure of simple sentences is formed by phrases. These units consist of one word or indivisible parts and modal units, which differ from traditional two-part or one-part sentences. Phrases are not divided into separate syntactic parts and do not perform a nominative function, that is, they do not name anything. At the same time, they perform communicative functions in speech: confirm or deny an idea, express agreement or opposition, give an emotional assessment of the previous statement, and encourage various actions.

Interjections are used mainly in dialogical speech and are characteristic of the oral, conversational style. They are divided into different types: affirmative, negative, interrogative, as well as units expressing emotional-voluntary and exclamatory functions. For example, affirmative interjections are used to confirm the interlocutor's opinion:

— Let the headquarters be located. Is the moon rising?  
— True.

Negative interjections convey the meaning of denial:

— Is he sleeping?  
— No.

Interrogative interjections are used to attract attention or ask for clarification:

— Evgeny Nikolaevich!  
— Yes?

Also, interjections expressing emotional-voluntary or exclamatory functions give an additional emotional coloring to speech:

— Ay, ey, ay! — an expression of surprise or sadness;  
— Tsits! — a call to action;  
— Au! — an expression of a call or surprise.

Babaytseva notes that there are two main features that distinguish sentences:

1. The syntactic feature of sentences is that they are sentences that cannot be divided into parts. In other words, it is impossible to distinguish parts of a sentence in sentences. Therefore, they are not included in two-part or one-part sentences.

2. The morphological feature is related to their lexical-morphological composition. Sentences are usually expressed by modal words, exclamations or particles. It is this grammatical feature that allows them to function as independent sentences.

According to their morphological structure, words are divided into the following groups:

1. Words expressed by particles - units such ha, yo‘q, shunday, aniq, ha-a, ayan shunday (as yes, no, so, exactly, yes-a, exactly so.)

Affirmative: Ha, Shunday, Albatta. (Yes, So, Of course.)

Negative: Yo‘q, Aslo yo‘q. (No, Not at all.)

Interrogative: Nahotki?, Rostdanmi? (Is it true?, Really?)

2. Words expressed by modal words - units such as *albatta* , *tabiiy* , *ehtimol* , *bo'lishi mumkin*, *fakt*, *to'g'ri* (certainly, naturally, probably, may be, fact, right.)  
Such words express an attitude to an idea, confidence, assumption or certainty.

Some of them resemble introductory words, but they independently retain predicativeness, that is, sentence character (for example: “*Albatta* ” - when used as an independent answer).

3. Words and expressions expressed through exclamations - units such as *Ah!*, *Ura!*, *Tfu!*, *Voy!* They express emotional (feeling) meaning and are not grammatically divided into parts. Historically, in the studies of Russian syntax, the interpretation of incomplete sentences has varied. While representatives of the logical school saw it as any sentence that deviates from the ideal scheme, A. A. Shakhmatov narrowed the scope of incomplete sentences, emphasizing the existence of two independent structures - *dvusostavnyye* and *odnosostavnyye* sentences. At the same time, V. V. Vinogradov showed in his studies that incomplete sentences used independently have their own structural features and that it is incorrect to evaluate them by the criterion of completeness. For example, sentences like: “*У нас праздник. У них скука. Там столпотворение*” did not need grammatical “filling” but fully performed the communicative function

In Russian linguistics, the problem of incomplete sentences (*неполные предложения*) is considered an important structural component of the syntactic system. This phenomenon, first of all, reveals the inextricable connection between the grammatical structure of a sentence and its communicative and contextual function.

Linguist N.S. Valgina in her research defines incomplete sentences as “lexically incomplete, but semantically complete syntactic units”. According to her, the absence of some grammatical parts (primary or secondary parts) in such sentences does not violate the logic of speech, since the content of these parts is restored through the context or speech situation. For example, in the example of “*Вот этот сок нужен липе, тот — ландышу, тот — сосне, а тот — папоротнику или дикой малине (Куприн)*”, only the first part has a complete grammatical structure, and the subsequent parts are understood contextually: “*сок нужен*” is expressed in the first part, and in the other parts it is syntactically omitted.

Valgina emphasizes that such sentences have “lexically unnamed, but grammatically understandable” positions.

According to the scientist, incomplete sentences ensure speech economy and speed of communication, serve for laconic and natural expression of thought. In particular, they are most actively used in dialogical speech. For example, examples such as “— *Что беречь? — Ну, скажем, птицу разную. Или лес. Или воду...*” (Paustovsky) show that the speaker uses only the words that are communicatively necessary, and the remaining meanings are filled in through the context. Valgina also divides incomplete sentences into contextual and situational types. If in contextual sentences the missing parts are determined from the previous or subsequent sentences, then in situational sentences the content is restored through the speech situation. For example, “— *Булочник Коновалов здесь работает? — Здесь!*” In cases like (M. Gorky), the verb “*работает*” is omitted, but it is understood depending on the situation.

Thus, as N.S. Valgina described, incomplete sentences are a kind of dynamic form of the syntactic system, they are units that are more focused on communicative purposes than grammatical completeness. Their study is of great importance for determining the contextual mechanisms of text structure in the language, the pragmatic features of communication.

According to I.A. Popova, the level and nature of incomplete sentences depend on the following factors:

1. The functional direction and social tasks of speech - for example, conveying a specific fact, figurative expression, emotional impact, etc.
2. The specific form of speech - question, answer, command, emotional assessment, statement of a fact, etc.
3. The conditions and form of speech - oral or written, monological or dialogical.

In dialogic, oral speech, sentences sometimes convey the main information with a minimum of words. In this case, the form of the sentence may be random, but the main message is still conveyed. In monologic or written speech, sentences are carefully constructed in advance, and incompleteness is often purposeful and functional.

Also, the functional type of the sentence (question, answer, thought) is not enough to determine completeness, since any functional type can also be expressed in an incomplete form. Russian literature and scientific and journalistic works from the 19th century to the present day have studied about 5,000 examples of incomplete sentences.

A. M. Peshkovsky incorrectly explains the replacement of words with real representations as a factor causing incompleteness of the sentence structure in the speech environment. He believes that this can be interpreted as follows: real representations replace words. According to I.A. Popova, this concept is erroneous, and real ideas have not yet found expression in words.

From this point of view, in situational relative incomplete sentences, although the unnamed members actually exist, they do not have a complete word form in speech or thought. In such sentences, it is absolutely not necessary to guess the meaning or try to fill them in artificially, since this changes the natural, incomplete nature of the sentence and violates its substantive and structural structure. I.A. Popova emphasizes: incompleteness is a natural feature of speech communication, which is determined by the context and situation.

### Conclusion

This study analyzes the phenomenon of interjections, utterances, and incomplete sentences from a linguistic perspective. Historically, interjections have been viewed as peripheral or marginal units outside the central parts of language, whereas modern approaches view them as linguistic units with rich semantic and pragmatic content. According to T. Wharton, analyzing interjections on the continuum of showing and saying allows us to better understand their role in expressing emotions and social communication. The Relevance Theory approach allows us to interpret interjections not only in terms of their information content, but also in terms of how they are conveyed.

Also, utterances are studied as separate speech units. According to the research of N.S. Valgina and Babaytseva, utterances consist of one word or indivisible fragments, which differ from traditional two-part or one-part sentences. They are not divided into syntactic parts, do not have lexical names, but perform communicative functions in speech: confirming or denying an idea, expressing agreement or opposition, giving an emotional assessment of the previous statement, and calling for various actions. Sayings are actively used in dialogical speech, and their morphological structure is usually expressed through modal words, particles, or exclamations. At the same time, they enrich the emotional and social layers of speech, and together with exclamations, they increase communicative efficiency. In Russian linguistics, incomplete sentences are analyzed as a unit that reveals the natural and communicative nature of speech.

According to the research of N.S. Valgina and I.A. Popova, although such sentences are syntactically incomplete, their meaning is restored through the context and situation, and they serve speech economy and laconic expression. Also, although situational relative incomplete sentences contain unnamed members, they do not have a complete word form in speech or thought, which allows preserving the natural and spontaneous nature of the sentence. Thus, exclamatory words, phrases, and incomplete sentences become important as a means of unifying the semantic, pragmatic, and social layers of speech, illuminating the relationship between the central and marginal parts of the language. Their study is of great scientific importance in understanding the complex and dynamic nature of speech communication.

### References:

1. Ameka F.K. Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech // *Journal of Pragmatics* . – 1992. – №18. – P. 101–118. – North-Holland.
2. 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>.
3. Бабайцева В.В. Избранное. 1955—2005: Сборник научных и научно-методических статей / Под ред. проф. К.Э. Штайн. — М. — Ставрополь: Издательство СГУ, 2005. — С. 103–114
4. Валгина Н.С. Современный русский язык: Синтаксис: Учебник — 4-е изд., испр. — М.: Высш. шк., 2003 — 416 с.
5. Warton T. *Pragmatics and no-verbal communication*. – Cambridge University Press, 2009. – P.70. [www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org).
6. Пешковский А.М. Сборник статей, Госиздат, Л., 1925, стр. 100.
7. 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>
8. Sapir E. *Language*. – New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1921. <https://www.ugr.es/>
9. Trask, R.L. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. – London. Routledge, 1993.
10. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech J. & J. Svartik (eds.) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman, 1985.