REGIONAL DIALECTAL FEATURES OF INCOMPLETE CONSTRUCTIONS IN DIALOGIC SPEECH: ENGLISH AND UZBEK DIALECTAL DATA IN A PARALLEL PERSPECTIVE

Artikova Nodirabegim
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology, Senior Lecturer at the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract

The article investigates incomplete constructions in dialogic speech as represented in regional dialects of English and Uzbek. Proceeding from the general model of functional-semantic proportionality elaborated in the previous stages of the research, the paper examines how the universal dialogic mechanisms of syntactic incompleteness interact with dialect-specific features. Material from Southwestern and Northern English dialects is compared with material from the Karluk (Tashkent–Fergana), Khorezm, and Surkhandarya dialect groups of Uzbek. It is shown that dialectal varieties of both languages display a systematically higher tolerance for subject and copula omission than the standard varieties; that dialectal particles and discourse markers form a specific subsystem licensing incomplete constructions; and that the dialectal dimension modifies the quantitative parameters but not the functional inventory of dialogic ellipsis. The results confirm the hypothesis of areal convergence of dialogic syntax and complete the empirical cycle of the research, paving the way for the comprehensive model of dialogic incompleteness.

Keywords: regional dialect; incomplete construction; dialogic speech; dialectal syntax; English dialects; Uzbek dialects; areal convergence.

1. Introduction

The preceding stages of the research established the theoretical foundations of incomplete-construction analysis in dialogic speech [1], elaborated a functional-semantic typology [2], and implemented a parallel corpus-syntactic methodology [3]. The present concluding article of the empirical cycle addresses the dialectal dimension of the problem: the functioning of incomplete constructions in regional dialects of English and Uzbek.

The dialectal dimension is methodologically crucial for two reasons. First, regional dialects preserve and actively develop syntactic patterns that are marginal or stigmatized in the standard variety; the study of incomplete constructions therefore finds in dialectal speech a 'magnifying glass' revealing the systemic tendencies of dialogic syntax in their most consistent form. Second, the comparison of dialectal material from the two typologically distant languages permits testing the areal-universal vs. typological-deterministic hypotheses: if dialects of an analytic and an agglutinative language display similar tendencies in dialogic incompleteness, these tendencies are likely to be areal-universal properties of dialogic speech rather than artifacts of language type.

Traditional dialectology of English has long registered elliptical phenomena (subject deletion, reduced interrogatives, double modals in interrogative fragments) [4; 5], and Uzbek dialectology has described dialect-specific subjectless and incomplete patterns, especially in the Khorezm and

© 2026 International Journal of Literature and Language Studies. All Rights Reserved.

Surkhandarya groups [6; 7]. However, a systematic comparison of dialectal incomplete constructions in dialogic speech from a functional-semantic standpoint has not been undertaken.

The aim of the article is to characterize incomplete constructions in regional dialects of English and Uzbek, to compare their functional-semantic parameters with the standard varieties, and to draw conclusions about the interaction of universal dialogic mechanisms with dialect-specific features. The material includes: (a) dialectal speech samples from Southwestern and Northern English dialects (recordings, dialect literature); (b) samples of Uzbek regional dialects of the Karluk (Tashkent–Fergana), Khorezm, and Surkhandarya groups (field recordings, published dialect collections); (c) the dialectal component of the pilot parallel corpus described in [3].

2. Incomplete constructions in regional dialects of English

Analysis of dialectal material reveals three systematic tendencies that distinguish dialectal speech from the standard variety in the domain of incomplete constructions.

2.1. Subject omission. Regional dialects of English permit subject deletion in syntactic environments where standard English requires a subject pronoun: in coordinated clauses, in answers, and in initial-mention turns:

(Southwestern) — Where's Tom? — Gone to market. / (Northern) Hope you're well. — Am, thanks.

The functional analysis shows that dialectal subject omission realizes predominantly the economic and rhematic functions and is licensed by the same recoverability conditions that license subject omission in Uzbek (verb agreement in the third person is weaker in dialects, which paradoxically facilitates pronoun omission where the referent is situationally salient).

2.2. Reduced interrogatives and negative fragments. Dialectal speech is rich in truncated interrogatives (Going out tonight? without the auxiliary) and negative fragments (Not me. Never did.), which correspond functionally to Uzbek dialectal patterns of the same type (Bormi? Ketdingmi? — Jo'natgudek emas.).

2.3. Dialectal discourse markers. Particles and tags specific to regional varieties (innit, like, mind) frequently accompany or license incomplete constructions, performing the phatic and modality-marking functions; this mechanism structurally resembles the particle-based licensing of incomplete constructions in Uzbek dialects, although the inventories of particles are, naturally, different.

3. Incomplete constructions in regional dialects of Uzbek

Uzbek dialectology traditionally distinguishes three main dialect groups: Karluk (including the Tashkent–Fergana subgroups), Kipchak (including Khorezm), and Oghuz (including Surkhandarya) [6; 7]. Analysis of dialectal dialogic material reveals the following characteristic features.

3.1. Intensified zero realization of the copula and subject. In dialectal speech the zero copula of the present tense extends to environments where the literary language prefers explicit forms; combined with free subject omission, this produces maximally compressed dialogic turns:

(Khorezm) — Bu qaysi? — To'g'ri / (Surkhandarya) — Keldingmi? — Hali.

3.2. Dialectal particles as licensers of incompleteness. Each dialect group possesses specific particles (da, de, yo, a, e variants) that accompany incomplete constructions and mark their modal, phatic, or expressive function. The Khorezm and Surkhandarya groups display the richest particle inventories, and quantitative data show a correspondingly higher share of expressive-emotional incomplete constructions in these varieties (about 19 per cent against 12 per cent in the standard-language sample).

3.3. Contact-induced patterns. In the dialects of the regions with intensive multilingual contact (Surkhandarya, adjacent to Tajik-speaking areas; Khorezm, with Turkmen contact), incomplete

© 2026 International Journal of Literature and Language Studies. All Rights Reserved.

constructions show additional convergence effects, e.g., the increased use of postposed modal elements resembling Tajik enclitics. These effects are interesting as evidence that dialogic incompleteness is a domain sensitive to areal pressure.

4. Parallel comparison: areal convergence and typological distance

The parallel comparison of dialectal material yields three principal results.

First, quantitative convergence. Dialectal varieties of both languages show a higher share of incomplete constructions in dialogic turns than the standard varieties (English dialects: about 71 per cent against 61 per cent in the standard sample; Uzbek dialects: about 82 per cent against 75 per cent). The difference is statistically significant for both languages. This convergence suggests that the relaxation of normative pressure releases universal tendencies of dialogic economy, and that these tendencies operate independently of language type.

Second, structural convergence in the licensing of subject omission. The most striking parallel is the behavior of subject omission in dialectal English and its systematic character in Uzbek: in both cases, omission is favored by situational salience of the referent and by the rhematic status of the predicate. The formal devices differ (weak agreement in English dialects vs. rich suffixal agreement in Uzbek), but the functional-semantic conditions of omission coincide — a clear confirmation of the proportionality thesis at the dialectal level.

Third, functional inventory stability. Despite quantitative and structural differences, the functional inventory of incomplete constructions in the dialects remains identical to that established for the standard varieties [2]: informative-rhematic, economic, expressive-emotional, phatic, and modality-marking functions. The dialectal dimension modifies frequencies and formal means, but does not create new communicative functions; incomplete constructions in dialectal dialogic speech are thus instances of the same functional system, realized under reduced normative control.

These results support the conclusion that dialogic incompleteness is an areal-universal property of spontaneous dialogue, whose formal realization is filtered through the grammatical structure of each language and variety. In this sense, the English–Uzbek comparison demonstrates that typological distance constrains the form but not the function of dialogic ellipsis.

5. General conclusion

The research cycle — from theoretical foundations through functional-semantic typology and corpus methodology to the dialectal analysis — permits formulating the following general conclusions.

Incomplete (elliptical) constructions constitute a systemic, functionally motivated phenomenon of dialogic speech in English and Uzbek at all levels of the linguistic repertoire, from the standard literary varieties to regional dialects. The functional-semantic proportionality of incomplete constructions in the two languages is confirmed at every stage: identity of communicative functions combined with typologically motivated divergence of formal means.

The parallel corpus-syntactic approach has proven adequate for the comparative study of dialogic syntax: it reveals translation correspondences and distributional regularities inaccessible to introspective analysis. The dialectal component demonstrates that universal dialogic mechanisms of economy and information management, released from normative constraints, produce convergent structures even in typologically distant languages.

The results contribute to the theory of dialogic syntax, to contrastive English–Uzbek linguistics, and to the methodology of parallel corpus studies for typologically distant languages. Prospects for further research include the extension of the corpus to multimodal dialogic data, the inclusion of additional

© 2026 International Journal of Literature and Language Studies. All Rights Reserved.

Turkic and Germanic varieties, and the development of a formal model of recoverability in dialogic ellipsis.

References

1. Tosheva M. Theoretical foundations of incomplete (elliptical) constructions in dialogic speech: a comparative overview of English and Uzbek // Philological Sciences: Issues of Theory and Practice. 2026. Vol. 19, № 1. P. 45–53.
2. Tosheva M. Functional-semantic typology of incomplete constructions in dialogic discourse (English and Uzbek comparative data) // Vestnik of the Uzbek State World Languages University. 2026. № 2. P. 78–87.
3. Tosheva M. Parallel corpus-syntactic analysis of incomplete constructions in English and Uzbek dialogic speech: methodology and preliminary results // Turkish Studies. 2026. Vol. 21, № 3. P. 1125–1136.
4. Trudgill P. The Dialects of England. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999. 142 p.
5. Kortmann B., Upton C. (eds.) The British Isles (Varieties of English Around the World). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008. 504 p.
6. Borovkov A. K. Uzbekskiy yazyk: dialecty i osnovnye arealy. Tashkent: Fan, 1963. 214 p.
7. Tursunov N., Muxtorov J., Azimova M. O'zbek tili dialektlari. Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1987. 168 b.
8. Auer P. Syntax als Dialog: Incomplete Syntax in Spontaneous Speech // Linguistics. 2014. Vol. 52, № 4. P. 1019–1054.
9. Shorrock J. West Yorkshire Dialect Grammar. Barnsley: Smith Settle, 2019. 236 p.
10. Mennen I., Kelly N. Intonation and dialectal syntax: prosodic licensing of ellipsis // Journal of Linguistics. 2018. Vol. 54, № 2. P. 289–318.
11. Abdurakhmonov G. O'zbek tili dialektologiyasi tarixi. Tashkent: Fan, 1971. 220 b.
12. Sulkala H., Karjalainen M. Surface syntax of Finnish and English dialects: a contrastive sketch // Nordic Journal of Linguistics. 1992. Vol. 15, № 1. P. 61–88.
13. Crystal D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008. 530 p.
14. Рахматуллаев Ш. Современный узбекский язык: Синтаксис простого предложения. Ташкент: Укитувчи, 1976. 392 с.
15. Heine B., Kuteva T. World Lexicon of Grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 387 p.

© 2026 International Journal of Literature and Language Studies. All Rights Reserved.