

FORMAL AND CONTENT-BASED CLASSIFICATION OF INCOMPLETE  
SENTENCES IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

*Avazov Khamza Panjiyevich*  
Teacher at Karshi State University  
[khamzaf1driver@gmail.com](mailto:khamzaf1driver@gmail.com)

**Abstract**

This article is devoted to the study of the classification of incomplete sentences in the Uzbek language according to formal (grammatical structure) and substantive (semantic-pragmatic) features. The article provides a general definition of incomplete sentences, analyzes their differences from complete sentences, and their relationship to the speech situation (context and situation). The main focus is on the formal and substantive classification of incomplete sentences.

**Keywords:** Uzbek, English, incomplete sentence, grammar, dialogue, verb, speech styles, ellipsis, oral speech.

ФОРМАЛЬНО-СОДЕРЖАТЕЛЬНАЯ КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ НЕПОЛНЫХ  
ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЙ В УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

**Аннотация**

Данная статья посвящена изучению классификации неполных предложений в узбекском языке по формальным (грамматический строй) и содержательным (семантико-прагматическим) признакам. В статье дается общее определение неполных предложений, анализируется их отличие от полных предложений, их связь с речевой ситуацией (контекстом и ситуацией). Основное внимание уделяется вопросам формальной и содержательной классификации неполных предложений.

**Ключевые слова:** узбекский, английский, неполное предложение, грамматика, диалог, глагол, стили речи, многоточие, устная речь.

**Introduction.** Incomplete sentences in Uzbek syntax are constructions in which specific constituents (such as the subject, predicate, object, adverbial, or attribute) are ellipped, yet they express a complete meaning through contextual recovery. These sentences play an important role in increasing the communicative effectiveness of language and are widely used, particularly in oral speech, belles-lettres, publicistic writing, and advertising texts. The specific characteristic of incomplete sentences lies in the fact that, despite apparent syntactic “deficiency” they convey full meaning from pragmatic and semantic viewpoints.

In Uzbek linguistics, the earliest research on incomplete sentences is prominently observable in the works of scholars such as A.Gulomov, S.Usmonov, and M.Asqarova. For example, A.Gulomov, in his monograph “O‘zbek tili grammatikasi”, characterizes incomplete sentences as “sentences that express meaning through omitted elements by relying on context” [1:156]. This definition underscores the contextual dependency of incomplete sentences but pays limited attention to their formal and semantic classification. S.Usmonov examines incomplete sentences as instances of syntactic compression and emphasizes their performance of communicative functions in oral speech [2:89]. This perspective illustrates that incomplete sentences function as succinct yet impactful means of expression in dialogic discourse. Nevertheless, similar to Gulomov, Usmonov does not accord profound consideration to the formal typology of incomplete sentences, confining his analysis largely to their pragmatic functions. Usmonov’s notion of “ellipsis within context” elucidates the specific characteristics of



incomplete sentences in dialogic settings, yet this concept is restricted to dialogic speech and fails to comprehensively cover incomplete sentences used independently.

**Literature review.** M.Asqarova considers incomplete sentences to be a tool of syntactic economy and underscores their communicative effectiveness[3:102]. Her approach illuminates the importance of incomplete sentences in minimizing temporal and lexical expenditure within discourse. Nevertheless, her analysis accords insufficient attention to formal classification. In our opinion, although Asqarova's concept of "syntactic economy" is valuable for elucidating the stylistic features of incomplete sentences, it fails to offer clearly defined criteria for their internal typology. A.Xo'jayev terms incomplete sentences "syntactic minimalism" and examines their communicative roles [4:78]. Xo'jayev's framework illustrates the employment of incomplete sentences as an economical instrument in speech; however, he too does not pursue a thorough analysis along semantic lines. The concept of "syntactic minimalism" advanced by Xo'jayev reveals the property of semantic compression inherent in incomplete sentences, yet this notion is restricted to incomplete sentences found in literary fiction and has not been broadened to cover the overall linguistic system.

Discussions also persist concerning the terminological interpretation of incomplete sentences. While the term "incomplete sentences" in Uzbek denotes a deficiency in syntactic structure, these sentences remain semantically complete, conveying their meaning through contextual recovery. For instance, in the dialogue from Abdulla Qahhor's novel "Qo'shchinor chiroqlari": "Rahimjon: Ikovi bir olmaning ikki pallas! Odilov: Qo'zievchi?"[5]. In this case, Odilov's utterance is syntactically incomplete expressing only the subject yet the full meaning is readily recoverable owing to the preceding context. This example aptly demonstrates the substantial stylistic importance of incomplete sentences as a literary device.

**Research Methodology.** An analysis of the approaches adopted by the aforementioned scholars reveals that, although a general consensus exists in Uzbek linguistics regarding the definition and functions of incomplete sentences, a unified and systematic approach to their formal and semantic classification has yet to be established. This situation creates certain difficulties in conducting an in-depth investigation of the place occupied by incomplete sentences within the language system. For example, Gulomov's definition remains general in nature and does not provide specific criteria for classification, whereas Usmonov's approach emphasizes pragmatic aspects while devoting comparatively little attention to formal classification. For this reason, the present section aims to systematically elucidate the formal-semantic classification of incomplete sentences and to expand upon existing research.

The formal classification of incomplete sentences is based on which constituent elements have been omitted from their syntactic structure. Within this classification, the following principal types may be distinguished

Elliptical sentences (or sentences with omitted predicates) are constructions in which the predicate has been omitted from the sentence structure, yet the meaning remains fully clear due to contextual ellipsis. In the Uzbek language, such sentences frequently occur in structures exhibiting parallel syntactic organization. For example:

*Men darsga, u esa bozorga. (Full form: Men darsga bordim, u esa bozorga bordi.)  
I went to class, and he / she went to the market.*

In this example, the predicates "bordim" and "bordi" have been ellipted, but the parallel construction and the surrounding context ensure complete comprehension of the meaning. M.Asqarova (1990) regards elliptical sentences as a means of syntactic economy and emphasizes their communicative efficiency[3:102]. Asqarova's approach effectively highlights the role of elliptical sentences in reducing temporal and verbal expenditure in speech; however, it does not



propose a classification of their internal subtypes (for instance, parallel-structured elliptical sentences versus independent elliptical sentences).

While Asqarova's perspective is significant in illuminating the functional aspects of elliptical sentences, it remains insufficient for a thorough analysis of their formal characteristics. In our view, elliptical sentences may be subdivided into the following subtypes:

1. Parallel-structured elliptical sentences (parallel tuzilishli kesimsiz gaplar): As illustrated in the example above, in the second clause of the sentence, the predicate is omitted by relying on the predicate expressed in the first clause.

2. Independent elliptical sentences (mustaqil kesimsiz gaplar): These are sentences in which the meaning of the omitted predicate is clear from the context, even though they lack parallel syntactic structure. For example:

*Suhbatdan keyin uyga. (Full reconstructed form: Suhbatdan keyin uyga qaytdim.)*

*Rahimjon: Ikovi bir olmaning ikki pallasi! Odilov: Qo'zievchi? (A. Qahhor)*

In this example, Odilov's utterance features an omitted predicate, expressed solely through the subject (Qo'zievchi).

Subjectless sentences (egasiz gaplar) are constructions in which the subject has been omitted, yet the identity of the subject (who or what) remains fully recoverable from the context. In the Uzbek language, such sentences are frequently employed in dialogues or in contexts where the subject has been explicitly established in preceding utterances. For example: – *Ketdimi? – Ketdi.*

In this instance, the subject (u "he/she") is ellipted in the response "Ketdi," but the meaning is completely understood because the subject is unambiguously specified in the preceding question. S. Usmonov designates subjectless sentences as contextual ellipsis and underscores their significant role in dialogic speech [2:92]. Usmonov's approach effectively elucidates the pragmatic function of subjectless sentences; however, it does not furnish precise criteria regarding their formal properties (for instance, which types of subjects may be omitted).

**Analysis and results.** The distinctive feature of subjectless sentences in the Uzbek language lies in the fact that they are frequently employed with the omission of personal pronouns (u "he/she," sen "you," biz "we") or nouns denoting specific persons. This can be observed in the following examples:

1. Subjectless sentences with indefinite-personal subjects:

*Keldi. (Full reconstructed form: U keldi.) "He/she came / arrived."*

2. Subjectless sentences with definite-personal subjects:

*Darsga bormadi. (Full reconstructed form: Murod darsga bormadi.) "(Murod) did not go to class."*

*Vazifani bajarmaganligi uchun kim tanbeh oldi? – Salim. (Sh. Rashidov) (Full reconstructed form: Salim tanbeh oldi.) "– Who was reprimanded for failing to complete the task? – Salim."*

Sentences lacking secondary constituents

In this category of incomplete sentences, secondary sentence members such as adverbials (hol), attributes (aniqlovchi), or objects/complements (to'ldiruvchi) are omitted. For example: *Olmadi. (Full reconstructed form: Kitobni olmadi.) "Did not take / buy (it)."*

In this instance, the direct object "kitobni" ("the book") has been ellipted, yet the identity of what was not taken is fully recoverable from the context. A.Xo'jayev designates sentences lacking secondary constituents as syntactic minimalism and emphasizes their communicative functions [4:78]. Xo'jayev's approach effectively demonstrates the role of incomplete sentences as an economical device in speech; however, it does not propose a classification according to their semantic subtypes.



Sentences lacking secondary constituents in Uzbek most commonly feature the omission of objects (to'ldiruvchi) or adverbials (hol). The following subtypes may be distinguished:

1. Sentences without objects/complements (to'ldiruvchisiz gaplar): Yozdi. (Full reconstructed form: Xatni yozdi.) "(He/she) wrote (the letter)."

2. Sentences without adverbials (holsiz gaplar): Keldi. (Full reconstructed form: Uyga keldi.) "(He/she) came / arrived (home)."

Here, what will there be? – Cotton, winter wheat. (Sh. Rashidov) (Full reconstructed form: Bu yerlarda paxta va kuzgi bug'doy bo'ladi.) "Here, there will be cotton and winter wheat."

The semantic classification of incomplete sentences is based on their communicative purpose, functional role, and pragmatic characteristics. Within this classification, the following principal types may be distinguished:

Fragmentary responses (bo'lak javoblar) are incomplete sentences that provide a brief, targeted answer containing only the essential information required by the question. In the Uzbek language, such constructions are widely used in dialogue. For example: – *Kim keldi?* – *Murod.* (Full reconstructed form: Murod keldi.) "– *Who came?* – *Murod.*"

M.Asqarova regards fragmentary responses as an economical device in conversation and stresses their strong dependence on context [3:102]. Asqarova's approach effectively demonstrates the communicative efficiency of fragmentary responses; however, it does not propose a classification of their internal subtypes (for instance, nominal versus verbal fragmentary responses).

Fragmentary responses may be subdivided into the following subtypes:

1. Nominal fragmentary responses (otli bo'lak javoblar):

– *Nima olding?* – *Kitob.* (Full reconstructed form: Kitob oldim.) "– *What did you take/buy?* – *A book.*"

2. Verbal fragmentary responses (fe'lli bo'lak javoblar):

– *Qachon kelding?* – *Kecha.* (Full reconstructed form: Kecha keldim.) "– *When did you arrive?* – *Yesterday.*"

Additional examples: – *Uyga bordingmi?* – *Ha, uyga.* (Full reconstructed form: Ha, uyga bordim.) "– *Did you go home?* – *Yes, home.*"

Replicative sentences (replikativ gaplar) are brief responses in dialogue that rely on the preceding utterance and most commonly express affirmation or negation. For example: – *Kitobni o'qdingmi?* – *Ha.* (Full reconstructed form: Ha, kitobni o'qidim.) "– *Have you read the book?* – *Yes.*"

S.Usmonov designates replicative sentences as dialogic ellipsis and emphasizes their important role in maintaining the natural flow of conversation [2:90]. Usmonov's approach elucidates the pragmatic function of replicative sentences; however, it does not provide a precise classification according to their semantic subtypes.

Replicative sentences serve to express affirmation, negation, or the provision of supplementary information. The following subtypes may be distinguished:

1. Affirmative replicatives (tasdiq replikalari): – *Keldingmi?* – *Ha.* (Full reconstructed form: Ha, keldim.) "– *Did you come?* – *Yes.*"

2. Negative replicatives (rad replikalari): – *Keldingmi?* – *Yo'q.* (Full reconstructed form: Yo'q, kelmadi.) "– *Did you come?* – *No.*"

Additional example: *Rahimjon: Zovurlarni bugun tozalabdimi cho'g'i?* – *Albatta.* (A. Qahhor) (Full reconstructed form: Albatta, tozalabdilar.) "– *Have they cleaned the ditches today, I wonder?* – *Of course (they have).*"

Nominal sentences (nominal gaplar) are incomplete sentences consisting solely of a noun or noun phrase, frequently conveying an offer, wish, request, or demand. For example: *Yana bir*



piyola choy. (Full reconstructed form: Yana bir piyola choy bering.) “Another cup of tea (please).”

A.Xo‘jayev terms nominal sentences semantic compression and highlights their communicative functions [4:82]. Xo‘jayev’s approach demonstrates the pragmatic role of nominal sentences; however, it does not propose a classification of their internal subtypes.

In our view, nominal sentences may be subdivided into the following subtypes:

1. Desiderative nominal sentences (istakli nominal gaplar): – Choy ichasizmi? – Choy. (Full reconstructed form: Choy ichaman.) “– Will you have tea? – Tea (yes, I will).”

2. Imperative nominal sentences (buyruqli nominal gaplar): Bir qalam. (Full reconstructed form: Bir qalam bering.) “A pen (please).”

Choy! Choyni bu yoqqa! (Full reconstructed form: Choyni bu yoqqa keltiring.) “Tea! Bring the tea here!”

Exclamatory/emotive sentences (emotsional gaplar) contain evaluative or emotional expressions. Although frequently incomplete, they function independently within their context. For example: Ajoyib! Voy! Zo‘r! “Wonderful! / Amazing!” “Oh!” / “Wow!” “Great! / Excellent!”

**Conclusion/Recommendations.** The classification of incomplete sentences in the Uzbek language, based on their formal-structural and semantic-content aspects, elucidates the functional roles they perform within the linguistic system and demonstrates their role as an effective means of enhancing communicative efficiency. This classification establishes a foundation for a thorough examination of the ellipsis phenomenon at both grammatical and pragmatic levels.

Existing studies (by Gulomov, Usmonov, Asqarova, and Khojayev) provide a general characterization of incomplete sentences; however, a unified approach to their formal-structural and semantic classification has not yet been fully developed. Consequently, the classification proposed in this section serves to systematically illuminate the formal and functional characteristics of incomplete sentences.

In contemporary linguistic scholarship on Uzbek, incomplete sentences are frequently analyzed in connection with ellipsis, which manifests as the omission of structurally necessary elements that remain recoverable from the linguistic or situational context. Such constructions contribute significantly to linguistic economy, allowing for concise yet contextually complete expression. They fulfill essential pragmatic functions, particularly in dialogic speech, situational interactions, and elliptical structures within complex sentences, thereby optimizing communicative effectiveness while preserving semantic clarity.

## REFERENCES

1. Гуломов А. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1975. – 143 б.
2. Усмонов С. Ўзбек тили синтаксиси. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон, 1984. – 203 б.
3. Асқарова М. Ўзбек тили синтаксиси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1990. – 279 б.
4. Хўжаев А. Ўзбек тили синтаксиси масалалари. – Тошкент: Шарқ, 2000. – 168 б.
5. Қахҳор А. Қўшчинор чироқлари. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон, 1970. – 244 б.

