# PREDICATE AS A LANGUAGE UNIT

## Zayniyeva Madina  Xurshidjonovna
*Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

### ABSTRACT
*The article studies as an aspect of understanding the phenomenon of predicative only as a relation of the content of sentence to reality, according to our understanding. This phenomenon can also occur within other units of language-words and phrases, expressions.*
**KEYWORDS:** *predicate, predicative, participle, particle, possessive*

It is only one aspect of understanding the phenomenon of predicative only as a relation of the content of sentence to reality, according to our understanding. This phenomenon can also occur within other units of language-words and phrases, expressions (this will be discussed in the following pages).  The fact that the predicative phenomenon is related to the person, especially the speaker, it does not require clarification, of course. It cannot always participate as one of the main factors for the real expression of predicative. Because it is often driven by the speech environment as an extra-linguistic factor, at the very least, it operates under the influence of the speech environment and is forced to reckon with it. Therefore, we consider it necessary to mention that the real expression of predicative takes place through the speech environment.  It is difficult to agree with the fact that the phenomenon of predicative is related to time, and that time is a factor representing predicative, because time has no meaning, both when we interpret the phenomenon of predicative in terms of language and when we understand it logically. In other words, as long as predicative occurs, it does not change, regardless of which form of thought is expressed in the present, future, or past tense forms. There is a predicative in some sentences that are not related to the notion of a tense. Even when we understand a predicative as a participle, the tense has nothing to do with it. If there is one side to this problem, we will see the other side in some languages as predicative (discussed in later pages). Therefore, tense cannot be an integral part of the predicative category. Predicative can be fully agreed with the role of the notion of modality in the expression of the predicative phenomenon anditssignificance. Speaking of modality, Sh. Bally describes it as the "soul of sentence" and concludes that "as if it were thought, it is the result of the active actions of the speaker", as Sh. Balli rightly points out, that modality in sentence is formed by the speaker. Some modal verbs and modal words have different orientations. While such words express modality by themselves, they cannot express predicative. They react to reality when applied realistically in speech and are simultaneously activated in predicative expressions.  But here, the participation of the speaker plays an important role. Although the speaker is one of the extra-linguistic factors, it is the main means that consciously functions in the transfer of language elements to speech (from the paradigmatic line to the syntagmatic line). Apparently, in V.V. Vinogradov's teaching, although there are serious explanatory points, an attempt has been made to substantiate the phenomenon of predicative from a grammatical (syntactic) point of view. However, although the phenomenon of predicative is interpreted as a grammatical category in the work of most linguists, the differences that exist between logical verdict and sentence notions are not reasonably interpreted. For example, one of the famous Russian linguists, V.G. Admoni sees the phenomenon of predicative in the active dynamic relationship between the subject and the predicate, and considers this relationship as one of the most necessary conditions in the formation of any sentence. We perceive that there are commonalities in A.A. Shakhmatov's opinion in the theory of V.G. Admoni. Because A.A. Shakhmatov also noted that predicateness is formed in a "participle" relationship with "possessive". However, this idea did not satisfy some linguists. The main reason for this was the existence of one-syllable sentences. For example, M.I. Steblin rightly criticizes the theory of Kamenskiy A.B., Shakhmatov A.A. and makes the following comments: "If the possessive-participle is a part of speech in a predicative relation, in sentences without a participle there is no part that forms a predicative

# EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)

relation with the possessive. In that case, such sentences (one- clause sentences – Z.M.) should be called sentences without a predicative unit (without a predicate). M.I.Steblin says, Kamensky emphasizes that the predicative sign of a sentence is directly related to the participle. However, at the same time, it reminds us that the presence of a predicative cannot be the main sign of a sentence, but rather that it can be observed in units other than the sentence. M.I. Steblin says, Kamensky connects the notion of predicative with a participle, he concludes that it represents any sentence that contains a participle: "Predicative, or predicative relation - this is the same relationship between the subject and the predicate in logic, depending on the content". According to M.I. Steblin  there are many inconsistencies on predicative in Kamensky's views. First, the notion of predicative is equated with the notion of participle, and the grammatical rules are confused with the rules of logic. Second, the fact that the notion of predicative also applies to sentences without participle which are not put on the agenda, and it is concluded that predicative requires a relationship between the subject and the predicate, which is characteristic only of a logical judgment. According to V.Z. Panfilov, the content of the predicate is inherent not in any part of the sentence, but in its structure as a whole. There is such a fundamental difference between predicate and particle as there is a difference between possessive and logical subject. The correspondence between predicative and participle can be observed only if the possessive represents a logical subject and the participle a predicate. V.Z. Panfilov's predicative phenomenon depends on the complete form of the sentence, the structure obtained as a whole. Because predicative connects the whole content of the sentence with reality, not any particular part of it. In addition, we realize that in V.Z. Panfilov's theory, the notion of modality, which is directly related to predicative, is also expressed. The author interprets modality as a predicative category specific to the whole content of the sentence, and at the same time correctly points out that the verb, which has been interpreted as a predicative category in many scientific literatures, has no predicative feature in the inclination category. T.I. Desherieva emphasizes that modality is one of the main factors that create the phenomenon of predicative: "Modality (along with language categories such as time, aspect, case, number) is the main tool that creates predicative. So it is an integral part of predicative". In addition, T.I. Desherieva also comments on the tone of predicative means. However, the author analyzes the tone in the context of the problem of dividing the sentence into actual parts and connects the notion of predicative with it. This, in turn, shows that the notion of predicative is interpreted logically, not from a grammatical point of view. It is impossible to imagine the division of a sentence into actual parts without a logical stress.

Yu.S. Stepanov speaks of modality, he admits that it is observed in every sentence and is a sign of predicative (prediction in Yu.S.Stepanov– X.Xayrullayev). Yu.S. Stepanov emphasizes that the phenomenon of predicative has absolutely no connection with tense  and concludes: "Predication is a  phenomenon that requires a relationship that is not related to tense. Since there can be sentences in which the verb and its tense category are not observed, it means that prediction is not subject to the notions of verb and tense". Yu.S. Stepanov emphasizes that this idea is fully confirmed in practice, and gives an example of E. Benvenist thought. According to E. Benvenist, non-verbal sentences (nominal sentence) expressions in ancient Indo-European languages, including Homer, always conveyed a message that had nothing to do with tense. In the case of verb participles, the non-verb participles are expanded in a specific way. If the mode of existence of the subject is not clearly indicated in non-verbal sentence, this thing finds its expression in verbal sentences.

(Этот воин - победитель.- This warrior is the winner. Воин стал победителем - The warrior became the winner).

It is possible to fully agree with these comments of Yu.S. Stepanov. Because the predicative expressed in a verb sentence does not change in a sentence with a verb participle. After all, the message's response to reality can only add additional character to the   sentence through tense.

According to A.G. Rudnev, the predicative relation is formed between the main parts of speech. If the possessive in the sentence means an object of one or another quality, the participle reveals the real meaning of that object. Therefore, the expression of the predicative content falls on the edge of the participle.   In addition to the above, A.G. Rudnev explains that there is a double predicative in the sentences in which the separated part is involved, and gives the following example of A.A. Shakhmatov: Михаил, кузнец, работает сегодня в поле. (Mikhail, a blacksmith, works in the field today).

At the same time there is a double predicative:
1)   Mikhail - kuznets.
2)   Mikhail works today in the field.

A.G. Rudnev noted that the first element of double predicative is called "semi-predicative" in modern linguistics. Indeed, the first of these predicative signs, although it is entirely true that Mikhail is a blacksmith, does not give the full weight of the message expression.  In other words, the fact that Mikhail is a blacksmith at the moment does not form the center of the semantic form of the sentence, because the main purpose here is to remind that Mikhail is working in the field. Anyway, if we change the sentence to the style of Mikhail, a blacksmith working in the field today, then the semi-predicative in the previous sentence will have a full

# EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)

predicative character. Therefore, A.A. Shakmatov 's opinion on double predicative is not far from the truth. In general, the question of the separated parts of speech and the relation of the predicative phenomenon to it, we think, it may be the subject of a separate study. In A.N. Gvozdev's research, predicative is interpreted as the affirmation or denial of something in real reality. In doing so, the author focuses on modality and tone, and proves the importance of both factors through various examples. A.N. Gvozdev does not address the predicative phenomenon as a problem. H.S.Valgina emphasizes that the predicative phenomenon is expressed by the following means: categories of mood and tense of the verb, special conjunctions and other linking words. Apparently, in N.S.Valgina's theory it is emphasized that the predicative phenomenon is strictly related to the categories of tense and mood of the verb. However, it is visible that E.I.Shutova has a very reasonable opinion on this. E.I. Shutova under the influence of V.V. Vinogradov's doctrine does not agree with the interpretation of person, tense and modality categories as the main syntactic categories that provide predicative, and argue that there is a big difference between the category of predicative and the categories of person, tense and modality of the verb, which constitute different aspects of the language system.

These categories are not common in purpose and function. There may be a connection between them according to the expression of a particular goal. The author emphasizes that predicative is a universal phenomenon that can be observed in any language that is universal for all languages. Therefore, he bases his opinion on modern Chinese material, in which predicative is often expressed by a noun, and argues that it is expedient to interpret the above-mentioned verb categories as one of the morphological elements used in the expression of the predicative phenomenon, but not of a permanent character.

The teachings of R.A. Budagov also show that the verb does not have to be present in the message for the real expression of predicative. In this regard, it is possible to fully agree with both E.I. Shutova and R.A. Budagov. But in them, too, we realize, one-sidedness is allowed.

In other words, while it is true that a predicative issue requires a relation of a message to reality, it is emphasized that the object of the formation of this phenomenon can only be speech. This view is also characteristic of V.G. Gak's teaching on predicative. In this theory, the issue of predicative is explained to exist only in the context of speech, too. V.G. Gak shows that predicative and non-predicative combinations should be distinguished as follows: in a predicative relation the object or sign and the subject connection are determined by the thought process itself (Le cheval est blanc - horse-white; Le cheval court - horse running), in a nonpredicative approach, such a connection is determined before the speech environment in which the thought process takes place (un cheval blanc - a white horse; la course du cheval - a horse's running).

According to V.G. Gak, predicative has an external grammatical form of expression and forms a relationship between the participles. If this phenomenon can be called a formal-syntactic description of predicative, it should be understood as a relationship between the subject and the predicate from a logical point of view. It is also possible to interpret predicative as the relation of a sentence to a particular speech environment. Intonation is an important factor. However, these views do not negate each other. They are different aspects of the predicative phenomenon. We consider, while V.G. Gak has tried to substantiate the phenomenon of predicative absolutely scientifically, he does not pay enough attention to the existence of significant differences between logical rules and grammatical rules. After all, a logical predicate and subject can only in some cases correspond to the grammatical possessive and participle. Therefore, the subject-predicate, possessive-participle cannot be different aspects of a phenomenon. In addition to the above, V.G. Gak's theory also identifies person, tense, and modality as the main categories of predicative. Finally, it should be noted that V.G. Gak explains the phenomenon of semi-predicative as one of the more complex forms of poly-predicative (multi-predicative). It is more difficult to agree with this idea, because the phenomenon of semi-predicative occurs at the level of the central predicate (depending on it), and the concept of polypredicative is related to the components of speech, each of which can form its own center. Special attention should be paid to A.I. Smirnitsky's comments on the phenomenon of predicative. A.I. Smirnitsky interprets the phenomenon of predicative as a relation of a sentence to reality. However, A.I. Smirnitsky at the same time notes that the phenomenon of predicative is also observed in some words derived from it. He proves his views and opinions on this by the following examples: the word written on apart.

1. London is an independent word denoting the name of a city.
2. London is the title of the book.(name)
3. London - a word written at the top of the history (plan) of the city of London.
4. This is London. This - is London.

In above sentences, the fourth example, unlike the previous three, requires a fully predicative syntactic device. But in this respect the third example is much closer to the fourth example. Because there is no denying that it is a reaction to reality. In other words, the drawing can really give a complete picture of the city of London, its territory. In the first and second examples, however, no signs of predicative are observed, as they do

# EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)

not react to reality. However, it is also worth noting that the second example differs from the first in that it is closer to a predicative expression. In both the first example and the second, London requires a clear idea of a particular concept, not a simple word in our vocabulary. Such elements can be called representative words. A.I. Smirnitsky says that the ways of expressing predicative are different, but among them intonation is the most characteristic, having the similar features for all languages.  In addition, A.I. Smirnitsky argues that the phenomenon of predicative can be expressed  through personal forms of the verb, and sometimes even without the participation of the verb.

In A.I.Smirnitsky's teaching, it is rightly shown that the verb and its mood, tense forms are one of the various methods of predicative expression.The author considers the categories of person and number as secondary means. A.I. Smirnitsky emphasizes that there is a certain relationship between the participle and the predicative, the subject and the possessive, but they are not common (analogous) concepts. After all, if there is a possessive and a participle they are considered as languages units, then the predicate and the subject are the objects of thought.  Of course, there is no doubt that there is a special relationship between the participle and the possessive.

## REFERENCES

1.  *Admony V.G. Vvedeniye v sintaksis sovremennogo nemetskogo yazika. –M.: Izd-vo literature na ing. ya, 1955, 311 s.*
2.  *Bally Sh. Obshaya lingvistika I voprosi frantsuskogo yazika. –M.: Inastrannaya literature, 1955, 416 s.*
3.   *Budagov R.A. Vvedeniye v nauku o yazike. –M.: Prosvisheniye, 1965,492 s.*
4.  *Valgina N.S. Sintaksis sovremennogo russkogo yazika. – M.: Visshaya shkola, 1973,423 s.*
5.  *Gak V.G. Teoriticheskaya grammatika frantsuskogo yazika. Sintaksis. – M.: Visshaya shkola, 1981,208 s.*
6.  *Gvozdev A.N. Sovremenniy russkiy literaturniy yazik. II.–M.: Prosvisheniye, 1968,344 s.*
7.  *Desheriyeva T.I. O sootnosheniye modal'nosti I predikativnos'ti//Voprosi yazikoznaniya, №1, 1987,-S. 40*
8.  *Panfilov B.Z. Vzaimootnosheniye yazika I mishleniya. –M.: Nauka, 1971,231 s.*
9.  *Pobednya A.A. Iz zapisok russkoy grammatike, t.I. –Voronij, 1874; t. II. Xar'kov, 1874.*
10. *Rudnev A.G. Sintaksis sovremennogo russkogo yazika. – M.: Visshaya shkola, 1968, 319 s.*
11. *Smirnitskiy A.I. Sintaksis angliyskogo yazika. – M.: literature na ing. ya, 1957, 280 s.*
12. *Stepanov Yu.S.Osnovi obshego yazikoznaniya. –M.: Prosvisheniye, 1975, 267 s.*
13. *Shaxmatov A.A. Sintaksis russkogo yazika. – M.: Uchpedgiz, 1941.*
14. *Shutova E.I. Voprosi teorii sintaksisa.  –M.: Nauka, 1984,261 s.*