

Other linguists who examined metonymic transference as J. Dubois confirm that the concept of replaceable and substitutable do not have common semantic relation, if on the basis of metaphor the semiotic intersection of two classes is assumed, then metonymy acts in the domain of non-overlapping classes [General rhetorics 1986, 213-219]. From the presented above we can conclude that as metonymy grasps two notions that are connected with each other with constant relations, its logical basis is the relation of inclusion.

The interpretation of the essence of metonymic transferences on the basis of componential analysis seems inaccurate due to many reasons. Firstly, the very selection of semes is accidental, because there are no concrete criteria by which the given process is performed. Besides, it is not always obvious to which extend should words be divided into their constituent components. As a result of the lack of a single criterion for choosing semes included in the words, the same material is interpreted differently, which can be the reason for ambiguity of metonymic transference.

It would be appropriate to state that all approaches mentioned above describe mechanism of metonymic transference, but it is not enough to explain and interpret the notion itself. The studies and observations reveal that the issue of metonymic transference still remains ambiguous and it requires more concrete investigations and facts to obtain entire developing of the problem.

Literature

1. Пауль, Г. Принципы истории языка. – М.: Иностр, лит., 1960. – С.55.
2. Lakoff G. Women, fire and dangerous things The University of Chicago Press Chicago and London, 1987. – P. 86.
3. Mirtojiyev M. O‘zbek tili semasiologiyasi. – Toshkent: Mumtoz so‘z, 2010. – B. 89.
4. Потебня, А. А. Теоретическая поэтика. – М.: Выс. Шк., 1990. – С. 182-186.
5. Фомина, М.И. Современный русский язык. Лексикология / М.И. Фомина — 3-е испр. и доп. изд. – М.: Выс, шк., 1990. – С. 57-58.
6. Пауль, Г. Принципы истории языка. – М.: Иностр, лит., 1960. – С.187.
7. Некрасова, Е. А. Метонимический перенос в связи с некоторыми проблемами лингвистической поэтики АН СССР. Ин-т рус. яз. – М.: Наука, 1975. – С. 127-128.

THE SYNTAX-SEMANTICS INTERFACE OF ELLIPSIS: ISSUES AND ANALYSES

**Nazarli Fidan Sadiq,
Müəllim**

**Email: nazarli.fidan1@gmail.com
Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University
ORCID: 0000-0002-4517-6048**

Abstract. This article explores the phenomenon of ellipsis at the syntax– semantics interface, emphasizing its structural, pragmatic, and functional significance

in discourse. Ellipsis is examined as both a syntactic reduction and a means of achieving cohesion within spoken and written communication. Drawing on the perspectives of major linguists such as Abdullayev, Baranova, Reunova, Grudeva, Bally, and Halliday & Hasan, the paper highlights ellipsis as a mechanism that enhances economy of expression, reduces textual redundancy, and contributes to semantic clarity. The analysis shows that elliptical constructions are not signs of incompleteness but independent structural-semantic units with specific communicative roles. Ultimately, the study demonstrates the importance of ellipsis for understanding text organization, pragmatic interaction, and the development of general syntactic theory.

Key words: *elliptical sentences, pragmatics, cohesion, syntactic-level*

Introduction

Ellipsis, as a linguistic phenomenon, is one of the structural parameters contributing to text formation, and therefore plays a crucial role in textual organization. More precisely, it represents one of the primary formal means of ensuring cohesion within discourse. Any instance of ellipsis exists within the framework of syntactic constructions and, in various ways, reveals the structural, semantic, and rhythmic–intonational integrity of the whole.

Ellipsis can be defined as the implicit realization of a syntactically necessary unit within a construction. Functioning as a syntactic process that relies on contextual support, ellipsis is characterized by the omission of a unit not explicitly expressed in the sentence structure. The distributive relations between two or more units allow for the omission of one of them in discourse. The preserved unit, by its directional nature, enables the speaker to omit the element while simultaneously allowing the hearer to restore it.

Methods

This study examines ellipsis through a combination of structural, semantic, and pragmatic approaches. The analysis relies on linguistic theories, including structural grammar, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. Comparative analysis of various scholarly approaches is presented, such as those of Reunova, Kovalenko, Grudeva, Skovorodnikov, Bally, and Shendels. Special emphasis is placed on dialogic discourse, contextual reconstruction, and cross-sentence versus intra-sentence ellipsis.

Results

Within the anthropocentric paradigm, growing interest in the content side of linguistic units and phenomena has drawn attention to the pragmatic aspects of ellipsis. As a result, different approaches have enriched its study with new nuances. A fundamental principle of linguistic pragmatics is the investigation of the concrete speech situation (consituation) in which the communicative act occurs. Pragmalinguistics, aiming to examine communicative categories that reflect different aspects of speech acts, focuses on uncovering and describing the principles governing the reflection of pragmatic information in communication.

Discussions

Historically, ellipsis has been associated with incompleteness—that is, with the omission of elements whose restoration is possible only through context, situation, or the shared knowledge base of communication participants. As K. M. Abdullayev notes, “*ellipsis, i.e. the omission of a sentence member, does not imply that the syntactic position in question remains unoccupied. The restoration of the omitted member can be achieved through the structural position within the sentence as well as through the broader text and situation conditioning that position.*” [1., 73].

From a linguistic perspective, an elliptical construction may be regarded as both a structural-grammatical and semantic unit. The structural-semantic organization of an elliptical sentence can be analyzed in terms of semantic incompleteness and the ways in which this incompleteness is resolved. According to A. N. Baranova, “*the primary sources for filling such incompleteness are dialogue, the contextual environment of sentences, and real speech situations.*” [4., 84-95]. Ellipsis manifests most prominently in spoken discourse, since features such as spontaneity, situational dependency, and emotional coloring create a fertile ground for its realization.

Ellipsis is a significant property of live speech (dialogic discourse). As E. V. Kovalenko observes, “*the meaning of function prevails over the meaning of structure.*” [6., 117]. In dialogue, ellipsis serves as a means of reinforcing semantic relations between utterances, while also functioning as a device for expressing semantic references that drive the development of the dialogic text. O. I. Reunova argues that “*ellipsis helps organize the sequencing of information more clearly: the parts of an informational chain are transformed through synonymic substitutions that contribute to semantic detail.*” [7., 26].

By treating elliptical sentences as independent structural types with their own distinctive features, Reunova concludes that “*the surface structures of full and elliptical sentences are transformations of the underlying structures of complete and elliptical sentences that belong to the same constructive category.*” [7., 97]. In her monograph, she carefully analyzes the “nature” of ellipsis, aiming to determine its place within the general theory of communicative processes. She attempts to specify the parameters of the algorithm for interpreting ellipsis, its role in the semantic organization of speech activity, and the regularities governing its formation and functioning. [7., 99].

E. V. Grudeva, meanwhile, unites the notions of ellipsis and incompleteness, emphasizing ellipsis’s main function in language: the reduction of textual redundancy. In her view, “*if the text did not possess the necessary degree of redundancy that allows the omission of certain informational units without semantic loss, the effect of ellipsis would be impossible.*” [5., 6]. This interpretation, in our opinion, appears more convincing than A. V. Skovorodnikova’s view of ellipsis merely as a “*speech-saving or laconicizing function.*” [8] Here, the essence of ellipsis becomes clear: elliptical sentences are, in fact, complete sentences, in which omission has a formal rather than semantic character, making the restoration of the omitted component unnecessary and often even misleading for interpretation.

Ellipsis should therefore be understood as a phenomenon of syntactic reduction of a component in the sentence, explicitly realized as a special form of compression,

which—due to the surrounding context or dialogic situation—still allows the omitted unit to be reconstructed in its full form.

Interestingly, similar views are found in Charles Bally, who described ellipsis as “*the sign intended in speech.*” [3.,175]. Bally draws a clear distinction between “the intended sign in language,” with its strictly grammatical meaning, and “ellipsis in speech,” which, depending on circumstances, may represent any word or group of words, provided that it functions lexically. [3.,176]. Importantly, his assertion that “ellipsis occurs more in spoken than written language” does not preclude its occurrence in written discourse, where omitted lexical signs often find their justification in surrounding context. [3.,175] This idea is echoed by E. I. Shendels, who asserts that “ellipsis is based on textual indices.” [9., 248].

M. A. K. Halliday and R. Hasan highlight the necessity of studying ellipsis not only within sentences but also across them. They stress that ellipsis “*is not limited to clauses but is also encountered between sentences, which is why this type of ellipsis is regarded as ‘cohesive.’*” [2.,136].

When viewed primarily through the prism of intra-sentential relations, ellipsis most frequently occurs among subordinate clauses in complex sentences. In such cases, ellipsis does not create connections across sentences and may thus be described as a “non-linking” ellipsis.

In all languages, communication employs various devices, one of which is the tendency to use ellipsis. However, the pragmatic scope of ellipsis remains imprecise due to its functional diversity. As a result, a wide range of interpretations arises, distinguishing elliptical constructions in terms of both functional and grammatical features. Even so, the functional potential and constraints of each structural type remain only partially clarified, which has led to proposals to analyze elliptical constructions across different functional styles of English.

Ultimately, the study of ellipsis provides key insights into economy of expression at all levels of language. At the syntactic level, research on elliptical sentences is of particular significance for the development of general syntactic theory, since elliptical sentences represent characteristic communicative-constructive structures that are highly recurrent in the actual realization of language.

References

1. Abdullayev, K.M. Azərbaycan dili sintaksisinin nəzəri problemləri / K.M. Abdullayev. – Bakı: Maarif, 1998. – 284 s.
2. Halliday, M.A.K. Cohesion in English / M.A.K. Halliday, R. Hasan: London: Longman, 1976. – 374 p.
3. Балли, Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка / Ш. Балли. – М.: Изд-во иностр. литературы, 1955. – 416 с.
4. Баранов, А.Н., Крейдлин Г.Е. Структура диалогического текста: лексические показатели минимальных диалогов/ А.Н. Баранов, Г.Е. Крейдлин // Вопросы языкознания, 1992. – Вып. 3. – с. 84–95.
5. Грудева, Е.В. Избыточность текста, редукция и эллипсис (на материале русского языка): диссертация... доктора филологических наук / Е.В.Грудева. – Санкт-Петербург, 2008. – 473 с.

6. Коваленко, Е.В. Эллиптические структуры как элемент художественного текста: Дисс. канд. филол. наук / Е.В. Коваленко. СПб., 2006. – 211 с.

7. Реунова, О.И. Эллипсис как лингвистическое явление: Монография / О.И. Реунова. Пятигорск: Изд-во ПГЛУ, 2000. – 230 с.

8. Сковородников, А.П. Экспрессивные синтаксические конструкции современного русского литературного языка / А.П. Сковородников. – Томск: издво Томского ун-та, 1981. – 256 с.

9. Шендельс, Е. И. Избранные труды: К 90-летию со дня рождения / Е. И. Шендельс ; сост. Л. А. Ноздрина. – М.: МГЛУ, 2006. – 352 с.

OLFAKTOR VOSITALAR TADQIQIGA OID BA'ZI MULOHAZALAR

Burxanova Mashxuraxon Muhammad qizi,

Farg'ona davlat universiteti dotsenti,

filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada hid sezgisi, uning kelib chiqishi, aniq, tabiiy va gumanitar fanlar doirasida o'rganilishi haqida so'z boradi. Hid sezgisining tilshunoslikka kirib kelishi, hidga asoslangan xotiraning kognitiv jarayon bilan bog'liqligi badiiy materiallar asosida tahlilga torilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: hid sezgisi, kognitivistika, olfaktor belgilar, noverbal vositalar, kreolizativ struktura, sezgi a'zolari, gnoseologiya, reprezentatsiya, lisoniy vositalar, semiotik tizim.

Annotation. This article talks about the sense of smell, its origin, and its study within the framework of concrete, natural and humanitarian sciences. The introduction of the sense of smell into linguistics, the connection of smell-based memory with the cognitive process was analyzed on the basis of artistic materials.

Key words: sense of smell, cognitive science, olfactory signs, nonverbal means, creolization structure, sensory organs, epistemology, representation, linguistic means, semiotic system.

Hid bilan bog'liq masalalar nafaqat noverbal vositalar tizimiga mansub muammo, balki semiotik belgilar sifatida noverbal tizimning alohida yo'nalishi deya qaraladi. U tilshunoslikning yangi yo'nalishlaridan biri bo'lgan kommunikatsiya nazariyasi sohasiga daxldorligi bilan ajralib turadi. Bu masalalar noverbal sistemaning ichki yo'nalishi sifatida farqlangunga qadar ham o'zaro aloqa-aralashuv jarayonining bir qismi hisoblangan. Ilmiy adabiyotlarda ta'kidlanishicha, "...insonning hid bilish qobiliyati olamni anglash bilan bog'liq jarayonlardan biridir. Aslida hidga aloqador tushunchalar borliqning ma'lum qismi sifatida mutaxassislarni doimo qiziqtirib kelgan asosiy muammolardan biri hisoblanadi. Inson sezgi organlari ichida hid bilish qobiliyati unchalik ahamiyatli deb qaralmagan bo'lsa-da, olamni gnoseologik jihatdan o'zlashtirishda bu sezgi organi eng muhim vazifalarni bajarib kelgan, noverbal muloqot asosini tashkil qilgan. Insonning hid bilish qobiliyati turlicha tasavvurlar manbayi bo'lib xizmat qilgan. Shuning uchun ham hidlar burun orqali qabul qilinib, aql, ong yordamida idrok qilinadi" [2, 2016, – B. 11-12] degan