GRAMMATICAL AND SYNTACTIC FUNCTIONS OF PREDICATES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Davlatova Muhayyo Hasanovna
Bukhara state medical institute
named after Abu Ali ibn Sina
The head of Uzbek language and literature,
russian and english department, PhD docent
hasanovnamuxa@gmail.com

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqola har bir tilning grammatik tadqiqot markazini o'rganishga bag'ishlangan bo'lib, hodisalar lingvistik birliklar shaklida ifodalanadi va o'zaro bog'liq ishtiroki birliklarning barpo etilishini ta'minlaydi. Grammatik tahlilning bu turlari tilshunoslik tarixida ko'p atamalar asosida ma'lum: grammatik munosabatlar, sintaktik vazifalar, ramka turkumlari, argumentlar tarkibidagi konstruksiyalar, argumentga bog'liqlik va hokazo. ma'lum bir tilda va boshqa tillar kontekstida to'g'ri o'xshashlik munosabati va farqlari.

Kalit so'zlar: munosabat, predikatsiya, birikma, kategoriya, farq, semantik xususiyatlar, tushuncha, sintaktik omil, natija, jihat.

ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИЕ И СИНТАКТИЧЕСКИЕ ФУНКЦИИ СКАЗУЕМЫХ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКОМ

Аннотация: Данная статья посвящена изучению грамматического исследовательского центра каждого языка, явления выражаются в виде языковых единиц, а взаимосвязанное участие обеспечивает установление единиц. Эти типы грамматического анализа известны в истории языкознания под многими терминами: грамматические отношения, синтаксические функции, субкатегоризация фреймов, конструкции, содержащие аргумент, зависимость аргумента и т. д. Одной из основных проблем, связанных с каждой ветвью грамматики, является выбор правильного отношения сходства и различия в данном языке и в контексте других языков.

Ключевые слова: отношение, предикация, сочетание, категория, различие, семантические признаки, концепция, синтаксический фактор, результат, аспект.

GRAMMATICAL AND SYNTACTIC FUNCTIONS OF PREDICATES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Abstract. This article is devoted to the study of the grammatical research center of each language, phenomena are expressed as linguistic units, and interconnected participation ensures

the establishment of units. These types of grammatical analysis are known in the history of linguistics under many terms: grammatical relations, syntactic functions, sub categorization of frames, argument-containing constructions, argument dependence, etc. One of the main problems associated with each branch of grammar is the choice of the correct relationship of similarity and difference in this language and in the context of other languages.

Key words: *relation, predication, combination, category, distinguish, semantic features, concept, syntactic factor, result, aspect.*

INTRODUCTION. Possessives, participles, objects are usually included in formal categories as purely grammatical relations. But due to the interaction of these categories, there is a huge semantic difference in the process of expressing events. In addition, if we compare a cross section of languages, then not only the syntactic tasks in them differ, but also the amount of meaning expressed by formal indicators. In particular, in English, participles and complex objects form specific constructions.

REVIEW. These structures are used to express resultant and causative meanings from a semantic point of view. These meanings are also interpreted as separate categories in English. In particular, causality and effectivity have many ways of being expressed as complex, overarching categories. They also reflect the attitude towards the objects of the external world.

In these relations lie the concepts of cause and effect existing in the mind. In the category of direct causality, there is also the concept of causality, and it is necessary to distinguish between the relationships that they perform. Since our study is not focused on causation and causality, we will not dwell on these relationships. In connection with the emergence of effectiveness and causality in structures close to each other, structural and semantic differences in them are analyzed.

DISCUSSION. The resultutive structures are considered to be a semantic feature arising from secondary predication. In particular, the American linguist S. Rothstein includes secondary resulting predicates in the aspectual-event type in terms of their relationship to the event represented by the main predicate (S. Rothstein; 2006, 209-233). The author argues that secondary predicates have descriptive and resultative semantic properties. He gives the following examples to illustrate the difference between the two:

a. John drove the car drunk.

b. John painted the house red (S.Rothstein; 2006, 209-233).

This example (a) has a descriptive predication. It has the meaning "John was driving drunk" and contains information about the night of the accident. Productivity in this sentence is expressed in the secondary predicate drunk in the II form of the adjective. In fact, *John was drunk even before he got behind the wheel*. But in the translation into Uzbek, the effective expression is not visible. In the following example (b), the information is recorded that "John painted the house red and as a result the house turned red."

Obviously, this is the result of the actions taken. Therefore, this example is evaluated as the resulting predication. Similar ideas can be found in (D.Dowty, 1991), (J.Carrier, J.H. Randall, 1992).

Many English linguists are also concerned about the direct separation of resultative and descriptive meaning, expressive and secondary predicates, and the acceptance of structure (S. Wechsler, 1997; B. Levin, Rappaport Hovav; 1999, 2001. Dj.E. Miller, 1997) discussed between them.

Therefore, they come to the conclusion that there is no need to divide these structures into descriptive and result types according to their semantic characteristics. In our opinion, since the combination of an indirect object and a secondary predicate is a combination specific to the English language, it is advisable to accept them as a special structure. Such an interpretation can shed light on their semantic features. We focus on the following examples of authors:

John laughed sick.

John laughed himself sick.

John sang the baby asleep.

In these examples, the adjectives sick and sleeping have a resultant meaning as a result of a change in the state of the subject as a result of the action expressed by the verbs laugh and sing. The study of secondary predicative structures is usually carried out syntactically and semantically. In our opinion, in their analysis it is necessary to cover both aspects. The analysis of language units (adjectives, nouns, impersonal forms of verbs, etc.) that perform the function of secondary predication is expressed in the form-syntactic approach.

The syntactic factor is the compatibility of the language units used in these constructions with the object. The meaning expressed in these structures is the result of a combination of the lexical meaning of linguistic units in the secondary predication function and the meaning of the linguistic unit in the object function.

For example: Then, when that offer wasn't leapt on with grateful thanks, 'Or I can arrange to have it delivered.'(LIZ FIELDING, 33); *They reined up with a plunge at the Casino entrance. The cab doors flew open.* (O'Henry, 59). The resulting meaning is associated with the lexical attribute of the compound word. The use of an adjective in a secondary predicate is directly adapted to the meaning expressed by the verb in the primary predicate. This case indicates a close relationship between syntactic and semantic factors. Therefore, it is required that the syntactic and semantic connection in each sentence have a basic, primary predication and be substantiated.

Effective constructions that arise due to the use of an adjective in the function of a secondary predicate mean to act on an object. Effective constructions that arise due to the use of an adjective in the function of a secondary predicate mean to act on an object. In this regard, R. Voshio, in the course of typological analysis, divides the effective phenomena into strong effective and weak effective ones. (R. Washio; 1997, 1999, 2002). The author states that in the strong resultative case the meaning of the verb and the adjective are independent of each other,

and subject causality means ergative result. As evidence, the author gives the following examples: a) *The horses dragged the logs smooth;* b) *The jockeys raced the horses sweaty.* (R. Jackendoff; 1990, 226. R. Washio; 1997, 39. R. Washio; 2002, 689). In the weak resultative case, the change in the state of an object under the influence of probabilistic causality is associated with the sign of the verb and gives the following examples: a) *He wiped the table clean*; b) *He sharpened the pencil pointy* (R. Washio; 1997, 227).

In our opinion, the classification of effectiveness into a strong or weak type is directly based on the actional semantics of the verb. R. The verbs drag, race used by Woshio have a feature that is not limiting in terms of action; it is under the influence of this semantic feature that these constructions express the ergative resulting meaning. The verbs wipe, sharpen, expressing weak effectiveness, are active-limited, and the meaning they express is effectiveness resulting from a change in the state of an object. In this case, R. Voshio connected the change in meaning with the fact that it is a sign of the verb, but does not pay attention to the fact that it is a sign of the action of the verb.

Resultant constructions are more common in English than in other languages. The following morphosyntactic forms are encountered: 1) resulting compounds expressed by adjectives. For example: *I wiped the table clean* (British corpora).

2) effective structures in which quality is part of the owner's complex. For example: *Your son could have been born clever* (British corpora).

3) resultative structures formed using ravish and ravish compounds: *I left behind the tree into pieces* (British corpora).

4) resultative constructions expressed by the adjective: People drank spirits and got drunk (British corpora).

Efficiency differs in different languages depending on the ways of expression. In particular, language units expressing productivity in English can be divided into three groups. The first of them, and the main ones, are constructions included in a special secondary predication; the second is a lexical expression characteristic of some finite characteristic verbs, and the third is a phenomenon characteristic of predicativity.

John painted the house red, Mary drank her coffee hot. Mary believes/considers John foolish (British corpora).

In the examples analyzed below, attention is paid to lexical productivity. Lexical effectiveness is combined with the content of reasoning under the influence of the lexical meaning of the verb. The expressed action causes the state of the argument to change. In this case, the effectiveness is expressed in the passive form of verbs with a limited set of features. A sudden fear seized Soapy that some dreadful enchantment had rendered him immune to arrest. (O'Henry, 46);

'I guess already that you have been stuck in the ribs with a knife. I have many times told you those Dagoes would do you up.'(O'Henry, 43);

As this dark mass had been transformed from a bright and love-endorsed flower to be an ignominious vegetable, so had her summer hopes wilted and perished. (O'Henry, 66).

RESULTS. The resulting meaning expressed in the main predicate is associated with the lexical meaning of the verb underlying the predicate. In this case, the effectiveness arising as a result of a change in state is aimed at the actor, it is due to a change in the qualitative feature or state of the nominative unit used in the possessive function.

The adjective involved in resultative constructions is the main morphological feature indicating this meaning, and is recognized as the main element constituting the syntactic structure. Therefore, in some cases it is also called a resultative phrase.

* The resulting constructions in English have clear morphological features, including the element in the role of a secondary predicate consists of an adjective, adjective II, a sign of the action of the infinitive;

* Effective structures in the function of a complex addition interact with causative and descriptive structures, in most cases one structure expresses two different meanings, effectiveness and causation, effectiveness and descriptiveness;

* In the Uzbek language, the resulting constructions reflect the action performed in relation to a locative, creative noun;

*resultative constructions in the Uzbek language are formed when the adjectival form of the verbs "to be", "to do" means a change in the case of the nominative unit in the leading and auxiliary functions;

CONCLUSION. In both languages, the resulting structures are formed using grammatical forms characteristic of the passive. In these cases, the limited active feature of the verb is important.

The adjective form II of finite characteristic verbs in English acts as a secondary predicate of a complex object, as a language tool that establishes a change in state and the result of an action in a determining function.

Although the resultative and perfect forms are close to each other in content, they differ in semantic realization in terms of the content of the expression. In particular, in English the perfect and resultant have certain grammatical formations, and their differences are clearly visible in terms of pragmatic expression and sequence of events. In the Uzbek language, the perfect and resulting meanings can only be determined in the context, taking into account aspects of the pragmatic expression.

The form of the adjective *-gan*, which takes part in resultative constructions and occupies an important place, means the necessary meaning in cases, depending on the activity nature of the verb and lexical meaning. When state verbs are used in the adjective form, we can observe the occurrence of a state or process in which the state of the subject is equal to the state of speech. It should be recognized that the influence of the feature of the action of the adjective, formed from the verb, is the main feature in the formation of the resulting structures of the adjective. Based on case studies, we can say that verbs with a limited characteristic in the form

of an adjective (II) lose the meaning of an action or process and express the effectiveness caused by a change in state.

REFERENCES.

1. Давлатова, М. Х. Работа над видеотекстам на занятиях Английского языка. Теория и практика современной науки, 242-246.

2. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). ASPECTUAL AND LEXICAL-SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION OF VERB NOVATEUR PUBLICATIONS JournalNX-A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal ISSN No: 2581-4230.

3. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Resultative and Causative Meanings in English and Uzbek Languages. TA'LIM VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI, 297-302.

4. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). ON THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF RESULTIVE AND CAUSATIVE MEANINGS. World Bulletin of Public Health, 9, 212-215.

5.Давлатова, М. Х. (2021). THE EXPRESSION OF RESULTATIVE AND DEPICTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 4(5).

6. Davlatova, M. X. (2018). THE EASY WAY OF LEARNING ENGLISH WITH THE HELP OF SONGS. Теория и практика современной науки, (4), 578-581.

7. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Semantic Implementation of resultutive structures. novateur publications JournalNX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal.

8. Давлатова, М. Х. (2013). Хорошее поведение-важный способ формирования личности. Вестник Таджикского национального университета, (3-6), 237-241.