



CATEGORIAL FEATURES 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

In the analytical forms of the auxiliary verb, the resultant and the main predicate in a certain sense lose their lexical meaning and express two types of action. In this case, one action is evaluated as the result of another. For example: *Your poor father bent his back; now you do not burn* (Said Ahmad, 255).

The coexistence of performance and static can be assessed as a grammatically related synonymy. Because in this case, performance is considered as the main value, and statics is a derived expression. The reason for word formation is that the occurrence of a situation is based on the form of an adjective.

For example: An old woman is sitting on the porch on the sunny side of the courtyard with cracked walls, fastening her waistcoat (Said Ahmad, 262). It seems that in the Uzbek language we can evaluate performance and static as phenomena that are close to each other in some cases, and it is possible to determine the difference between them only by referring to the context.

In this regard, the well-known linguist D. Nasilov expresses the following opinion: “The meaning of the resulting and stative forms do not negate each other, therefore they can change places in a certain environment (in this case it is expressed in the form of the resulting perfect)” (D. Nasilov; 1983, 118–120).

Lexical resources that make up effectiveness include structures formed by combining verbs expressing a situation with an adverb, an adjective and a noun of action (Bybee J., 1994: 53). *For example: The next day in the evening, Kholmat rode up to Oikol on his sweat-drenched horse* (Pirimkul Kadyrov, 244).

Lexical signs of effectiveness in most cases are associated with a change in state, the emergence of a new state. The combination of some auxiliary verbs with the verb "to be" (became) or compound verbs formed with the verb "to be" (became-became) can be attributed to the general lexical type of effectiveness in the Uzbek language. There are also known cases of the formation of resultant meanings by combining auxiliary verbs with a static meaning with nouns or adjectives.

For example: In one pass, Ikramjon bent his height (Said Ahmad, 289). The emergence of a new situation is carried out using the adjective form or the passive



participle form. In this case, the transitive verb is evaluated as the result of a dynamic action that took place in the past tense. For example: *A store-bought mustachioed driver, having opened the hood of the car and cooled the engine, closed the hood...* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 5).

It seems that the lexical properties of effectiveness depend on a number of lexical units, in particular, on verbs, as well as on grammatical indicators. The expression of performance can also be seen in transitive verbs with the meanings of having or achieving. For example: *Avaz, unloading his burden and heading home, tried not to think about anything but these majestic mountains and beautiful lambs in the forest* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 13).

In Uzbek, effectiveness is also expressed by the adjective form of transitive verbs. *For example: a broken chair, a pile of material*, etc. In resulting constructions, the unit subject to the adjective predicate performs the syntactic functions of the resultantly achievable attribute of the unit in the function of determination, i.e., effective expressions. Efficiency is also expressed in verbs of limited and transformative action of predicates.

REFERENCES:

1.Васильев Л.М. Форма и содержание языка как знаковой системы // Вестник ВЭГУ : педагогика. Уфа, 1996, 3 : 39-42.

2.[Problemy funktsional'noi grammatiki. Polevye struktury.](#)Russian Edition | by Ed. by A.V. Bondarko et al | Jan 1, 2005

3.Brosig B. Depictives and resultatives in modern khalkh Mongolian // Hokkaidō

4.Gengo bunka kenkyū.2009. No. 7.-P. 71-101.

5.Bybee J. L., R. Perkins, W. Pagliuca.The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world. -Chicago: The U. of Chicago Press, 1994. Carrier J., Randall J.H., The Argument Structure and Syntactic Structure of Resultatives //Linguistic Inquiry 23, 1992. -P. 173-234.

6. Goldberg A.Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure. L. - Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995. -265 p.Davlatova, M. H. Relation of lexical-semantic structure of verbs in the linguistic essence. *IEJRD-International Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(5).

7.Ризаев Б. Х. К проблеме лимитативно нейтральных глаголов современного немецкого языка. // Лингвистические исследования: Аспекты грамматического анализа. - М., 1990. - С. 131-140.



8. Сайфуллаева Р. Р., Менглиев Б.Р., Боқиева Г.Ҳ., Қурбонова М.М., Юнусова З. Ҳ., Абузалова М. Қ. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. – Т.: Фан ва технология, 2010. – 404 б.

9.Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. – Т.: «Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси», 2008. – 286 б.