

6-19-2019

STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC AND COGNITIVE FEATURES OF SECONDARY PREDICATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Sobir Khamzaev Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
UzSWLU

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Language Interpretation and Translation Commons](#), [Linguistics Commons](#), [Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons](#), and the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Khamzaev, Sobir Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) (2019) "STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC AND COGNITIVE FEATURES OF SECONDARY PREDICATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES," *Philology Matters*: Vol. 2019 : Iss. 2 , Article 14.
DOI: 10. 36078/987654349
Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm/vol2019/iss2/14>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Philology Matters* by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. For more information, please contact sh.erkinov@edu.uz.



Sobir Khamzaev

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD),
UzSWLU

STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC AND COGNITIVE FEATURES OF SECONDARY PREDICATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

ABSTRACT

Predicativity and the role of secondary predicative constructions in a sentence have always been considered as one of the topical problems of linguistics. The author of the article analyzes specific and similar features of secondary predicative constructions of the English and Uzbek languages. The category of event is considered as a category, which is important in the analysis of cognitive features of secondary predicative constructions in the discussed languages. Moreover, the article covers the peculiarities of the structure and semantics of the English and Uzbek secondary predicative constructions. Predicativity is a reflection of the essence of a sentence to the reality, and is expressed in terms of grammatical categories of person, time, and modality. There are two types of predication between the subject and predicate: primary and secondary. Constructions representing primary predication are primary predicative constructions and those which express secondary predication are secondary predicative constructions. Secondary predicative constructions allow a speaker to search for dependencies, interconnections, sequence, logical durations and other relations between events existing in the world and represent these relations using relevant language structures. Secondary predicative constructions enable a speaker to simplify, concretize complicated events, by avoiding unnecessary details and focus on the main essence, rather than the events. These means and tools are used in these constructions according to the communicative intension of a speaker as well as the characteristics of the

Собир Хамзаев

Филология фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори,
ЎзДЖТУ

ИНГЛИЗ ВА ЎЗБЕК ТИЛЛАРИДАГИ ИККИЛАМЧИ ПРЕДИКАЦИЯЛИ ҚУРИЛМАЛАРНИНГ СТРУКТУРАЛ- СЕМАНТИК ВА КОГНИТИВ ЖИҲАТЛАРИ

АННОТАЦИЯ

Предикативлик ва иккиламчи предикацияли қурилмаларнинг гапдаги ўрни ҳар доим тилшуносликнинг долзарб масалаларидан бири бўлиб келмоқда. Мақолада инглиз ва ўзбек тилларидаги иккиламчи предикацияли қурилмаларнинг ўзига хос ва ўхшаш жиҳатлари таҳлил этилган. Воқеа категорияси тадқиқ этилаётган тиллардаги иккиламчи предикацияли қурилмаларнинг когнитив хусусиятларини тадқиқ этишда муҳим ҳисобланган категория ҳисобланади. Шунингдек, мақолада инглиз ва ўзбек тилларидаги иккиламчи предикацияли қурилмаларнинг структураси ва семантикаси масалалари ҳам камраб олинган. Предикативлик – гап мазмунининг борлиққа муносабатининг ифодаси бўлиб, у гап ёки ҳукмда грамматик шахс, замон ва модаллик категориялари ёрдамида ифодаланади. Предикация субъект ва предикат ўртасидаги алоқа бўлиб, унинг икки тури мавжуд: бирламчи ва иккиламчи. Бирламчи предикацияни ифодаловчи қурилмалар бирламчи предикацияли ва иккиламчи предикацияни ифодаловчи қурилмалар эса иккиламчи предикацияли қурилмалар ҳисобланади. Иккиламчи предикацияли қурилмалар тилда сўзловчига борлиқда мавжуд бўлган турли воқеа-ҳодисалар ўртасидаги боғлиқлик, алоқа, кетма-кетлик, мантиқий давомийлик ва шу кабиларни топиш ва уларни мос келувчи тил қурилмаларидан фойдаланган ҳолда тил ситуацияларини моделлаштириш имконини яратади. Иккиламчи предикацияли қурилмалар борлиқдаги мураккаб воқеа-ҳодисаларни

situation.

Key words: predicate, predicativity, primary predication, secondary predication, secondary predicative construction, informativity, proposition, communicative intension.

нутқнинг мулоқот мақсадларига кўра содда-лаштириш, конкретлаштириш, турли кераксиз тафсилот ва деталлардан холи бўлиш орқали эътиборни воқеа ёки ҳодисага эмас, балки улар асосидаги моҳиятга қаратиш имконини беради. Бундай қурилмалар бу восита ҳамда усуллардан сўзловчининг мулоқот мақсади, шунингдек, нутқ содир бўлаётган лаҳзанинг хусусиятларидан келиб чиққан ҳолда танлайди ва фойдаланади.

Калит сўзлар: кесим, предикативлик, бирламчи предикация, иккиламчи предикация, иккиламчи предикацияли қурилма, информативлик, ҳукм, мулоқот мақсади.

INTRODUCTION

Language is not merely a communication tool for human beings, but also a means of identifying and perceiving the world by human beings, systematizing the knowledge about the world, naming things and phenomena, and grouping them. The language performs the functions assigned to it as a system of marks of these symbols. If simple characters – primary structures and constructions are used in identifying simpler objects, complicated language symbols – secondary structures are used to describe complex phenomena. Language units have primary functions, such as predicativity, modality, confirmation or denial of the existence of an object in the world.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In traditional grammar, the term predicativity is interpreted differently by scholars and is used to name various events. Usually, it is regarded as the main feature or element of a sentence. In the use of the term *predicativity* in the meaning of *predicateness*, it may be interpreted as “the relation of sentence meaning to the reality” [Barkhudarov L.S., 2008]. However, in our opinion, this interpretation is also a little bit contradictory, because the attitude to reality is a feature of a whole speech activity, not a specific sentence.

Nevertheless, there are some advantages of calling *predicativity* as the main feature of a sentence [Chomsky N., 2002; Litvin F.A., 1987; Pupinin Yu.A., 1992; Ilyenko 2003; Mamatov M, 1990; Makhmudov N., Nurmonov A., 1995]. Some linguists also explain *predicativity* as the presence of a predicate in the sentence. It also refers to the existence of a predicate, or the fact that a particular part of it exists in the sentence. *Predication* is a wider notion than predicate, and it is used not only in the field of linguistics but also in the philosophy and logics. However, there is no problem with understanding the “logical” and “grammatical” predicate in those languages where both terms are rendered in the same way. For example, in the English language only one term *predicate* is used compared to the Uzbek language, where two different terms to denote

this notion in linguistics and philosophy or logics are used [Jespersen O., 1983; Aki-mova G.N., 1981; Mamatov M., 1990]. Thus, by the term *predicativity* we understand the existence of a sentence, a predicate, and a proposition.

The specific type of predication in predicative constructions that complicate the semantic structure of a simple sentence is named differently by various linguists. For example, *predication of secondary order*, *half predication* [Abdurakhmanov G., 1981], *additional predication* [Mahmudov N., 1982], *dependent predication* [Yuldashhev A.N., 1977], *secondary predication* [Sweet H., 1998; Arutyunova N.D., 1989; Mamatov M., 1990] and so on. We agree with the opinions of H. Sweet, N.D. Arutyunova and M. Mamatov and thus we prefer to call this predication as a secondary predication.

Although they represent a separate proposition, secondary predicative constructions are not syntactically independent. We agree with M. Mamatov's statement that the secondary predicative constructions cannot form a sentence in an isolated form [Mamatov M., 1990]; indeed, these constructions do not possess full predicativity.

Secondary predicative constructions (hereinafter – SPCs) enable a speaker to describe the world at a maximum using the language units by dividing the events of different nature into structural fragments, segmentations, key events and secondary events.

Objective and subjective SPCs which are frequently used in the English and Uzbek languages are parts of participial SPCs. In addition, there are nominative absolute and prepositional predicative constructions that are formed with the help of various semantic groups of verbs, used to express different communicative intentions.

The predicativity of judgment and its verbalization (in some sources it is considered as grammatical formulation) has always been a matter of linguistics. This is because the basic, i.e., communicative function of the language is verbalized through predicativity. At the present time, linguists try to enrich the informativity of judgment, i.e. to express more information using less effort. This proof is evident in the way in which the SPCs, which are one of the components of predicativity are used in various ways. The SPCs provide a complete expression of the information in the sentence. These supplementary units can be synthetically simplified, but this does not always in the way of increasing the number of units that represent the judgment. Nevertheless, they can enrich an informativeness of a simple syntactic structure of a sentence.

Proposition is a logical form of expressing an idea. Confirmation and denial are the characteristic symbols of each proposition. The main difference of the notion from the proposition is that there is no confirmation or denial in the notion [Khayrullaev M., Haqberdiev M., 1993]. Each proposition consists of three basic elements. The first element is a subject, the second element is a predicate, and the third element is a conjunct word [Khayrullaev M., Haqberdiev M., 1993].

When new concepts and principles of analysis arise in any subject, new terms appear and are introduced into the usage. The old terms used in science cannot explain the essence of new concepts and principles of analysis. Newly emerged terms also function together with the terms that already exist. One of such new terms is the cognitive category *event*.

Speaking of categorization, it can be said that this process lies in the human activity. This is because, when anyone sees a new object, an event, or happening, s/he begins to compare them with the ones that exist in his/her mind and tries to categorize them into one group.

We share the ideas of M. Rasulova, who studied the problems of lexical categorization in linguistics, on the problem of categories in a language "... grammatical categories that represent general and essential features of the languages cannot reflect the differences between the languages, because the world is categorized differently in various languages. That is why, typological analysis in modern linguistics is to be carried out using different semantic categories, lexical and grammatical meanings that provide information about the world" [Rasulova M.I., 2005].

It is important to note the following opinion of Sh. Safarov on categorization: "... one of the main achievements of cognitive linguistics is the knowledge of the *traces* of previous experimental memory, which is a result of human activity, i.e. logical and linguistic systems of categorical understanding and various structures of high level units is the collection of a complex of information. The continuity of the relationship between these two systems is clearly reflected in the phenomenon of categorization" [Safarov Sh., 2006].

In general, as we think about categories, the following questions will likely come to our mind:

Where have the categories appeared and how are they structured?

Do they exist in the reality, does the human consciousness reflect them, or are they the result of human's perception of the world?

According to T.G. Skrebtsova, categories are the result of human perception of the world [Skrebtsova T.G., 2011]. In our opinion, it is possible to fully agree to this idea because if we say that "the categories exist in the world and the consciousness of the mind reflects them, then it is difficult for us to explain the abstract categories (friendship, love, hatred) that exist only in the human mind".

According to cognitologists, there are two alternative theories of categories on the subject of science today: one of them is the traditional view of categories, and the date of its occurrence goes back to Aristotle; and the latter is cognitive (in some sources prototypical) that appeared in the 70's of the last century [Skrebtsova T.G., 2011]. The second one is related to E. Rosh's researches. When it comes to the advantages of these two theories, cognitologists emphasize the importance of traditional categories for mathematics, logics, and natural sciences [Ungerer F., Schmid H.J., 1996]. In the analysis of categories, which are revealed by a human being in the process of perception of the world, it is emphasized the superiority of cognitive or prototypical theory of categories.

As a result of dozens of experiments carried out by scholars such as E. Rosh, U. Labov, theories about cognitive categories and such categories began to emerge in the science. These categories are usually based on the proximity or distance of the conceptual object to the imagined objects' prototype in the human mind [Rosch E., Lloyd B.B., 1978; Labov W., 1998].

The term *event*, which is considered as an object of researches and as one of the

categories of cognitive linguistics, began to be discussed in cognitive grammar in the late 20th and early 21st centuries by linguists as T. Parsons, L. Talmi, R., Furs and others [Terence P., 1990; Furs L.A. 2005].

DATA ANALYSIS

Events in all SPCs are specifically reflected. From a logical-grammatical point of view these constructions can be regarded as grammatically incomplete. The subject of SPCs does not have forms of grammatical categories such as person, number, tense, mood and aspect with the predicate. This incompleteness is a factor that syntactically differs them from sentences. From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, actions represented in SPCs are used to show stability and changes in the motion, and to make them individualized.

Category of *event* is not merely used to denote an event, but is regarded as a basic category in cognitive grammar. In cognitive grammar a category is regarded as a basic and main notion that represents the reality. There are many types of events: macro event, sub-event, co-event, framing event and so on.

In our research, the term *event* is adopted in Uzbek as *voqea*. The event represents a concept larger than action, status, or process because an event can combine several activities. In addition, there is a concept *sub-event* that cannot be used to describe the action or situation as *sub-action* or *sub-state*. But in general, actions and state can be regarded as sub-events.

We have accepted the category of *event* as a basic category because it is the main factor that shows difference of primary and secondary predicative constructions. This indicates that the category of *event* should be analyzed in a deeper, broader, comprehensive, multilingual context.

Below we analyze the structure of English SPCs.

John was said to die without a struggle. → It is said that at the reading of the will his children were furious [Crane S., 2004].

In such cases, adverbial modification plays an important role in the expression of the content. The first and most important event here is *John died*. Sub-events → *Children were furious; They read the will*.

Below we analyze simple sentences the structure of which is complicated by SPCs in the Uzbek language based on the basic concepts and principles of the cognitive category of event.

Odamlar, o'g'ri devorni qachon va qanday asbob bilan teshgani, ho'kizni qaysi tomonga olib ketgani to'g'risida bahslashah-bahslashah tarqaldi [Qahhor A., 1989]. There are two SPCs here:

- 1) *og'ri devorni qachon va qanday asbob bilan teshgani;*
- 2) *ho'kizni qaysi tomonga olib ketgani.*

The main story was “*People went away*”. Primary predication has its own motion-modifier; modifier *arguing* shows the manner of people’s going away.

SPCs help to reveal the essence of sub-events that verbalize the plot of the story in the speech. The first sub-event provides information about the tool and the time of the operation, and the second sub-event serves to modify the direction of the action

(i.e. theft incident).

Subjective Participial Constructions, Subjective Infinitive Constructions in English are different from Objective Participial Constructions and they do not serve the function of complementation; the purpose here is topicalization. The main purpose of this cognitive function is to transform this or that proposition into the basic thematic one and increase its informative significance. Below we will analyze an example to prove this:

Mr. Bob Sawyer was heard to laugh heartily [Christie A., 1996].

Mister Bob Soyerning miriqib kulgani eshitildi (translation is ours).

The syntactical structure of the sentences in English and Uzbek do not overlap with each other. The subject of the English sentence is *Mr. Bob Sawyer*, the predicate – *was heard*. In Uzbek, the subject of the sentence is *kulgani*, the predicate is *eshitildi*. The predicate overlaps in both languages, but the subjects of the sentences do not match. The reason for this is that the English language contains an SPC in the sentence, and there is only an attributive phrase in the Uzbek sentence. In the focus of the English sentence there is a person – Mr. Sawyer, whereas in the Uzbek language the event – *kulgu* (*laughter*) plays an important role. This can be summarized as follows:

1. The most important thing for the English people is a human.
2. The most important thing for Uzbeks is a human's activity.

It is worth to see if these ethical or verbal judgments are true or false. Though it is not always so, the English people think that they follow this principle. As a result, everyone thinks that the king, a beggar, a criminal, and a victim are equal, and as a result, sometimes they think and defend more the rights of a criminal rather than a victim. Evaluating the accuracy of this idea is to refer to people's judgment.

The focus of the Uzbeks is not the person, but his/her behavior, actions and or whether there is left goodness or evil after him/her. This ethno-moral character has been formed over thousands of years and is a developed character that cannot be changed in a few years. Even the globalization process is to work hard in order to change it.

There are two groups of subject-predicate relations within the sentences with SPCs. One of these two groups is fully grammatically formed, and the second one is a construction which is formed with the help of an indefinite form of a verb, which is expressed by a participle, an infinitive, (in Uzbek – an indefinite form of a verb) and a gerund (the name of an action in the Uzbek language).

Nowadays, efforts are being made to save language units in all languages while enriching the plot of the proposition. It is in this process where supplementary units of expressing the predicativity appear, and as a result, ways of expressing propositions also varied.

A.Nurmanov and N.Makhmudov consider that modality, which is the main category of predicativity, is the most important feature and the main part of a sentence [Nurmanov A., Makhmudov N., 1992]. Modality is usually regarded in linguistics as the relation of the content of a sentence to the reality and the attitude of a speaker to the content of a sentence. It is important to note, however, that predicativity and modality are closely related notions. Predicativity expresses relation of the informa-

tion expressed by a sentence to the reality in general, whereas modality expresses the relation of the plot of a sentence from the point of view of a speaker, or a speaker's attitude to the plot of a sentence. Subjectivity is of particular importance in both types of modality [Nurmanov A., Makhmudov N., and others, 1992]. The following thought about the interrelationship between modality and predicativity is also remarkable: "... The main modal part of a sentence is predicativity and it denotes general meaning of a sentence, and predicativity and modality are interrelated language phenomena" [Yakubov, J., 2006].

When linguists speak about the English and Uzbek verbal constructions, they refer to participial, infinitive (indefinite form of verbs in Uzbek) and gerund (the name of an action in Uzbek, which is regarded as «absolute truth» among grammarians. In its turn, this absolutism leads to the denial of existence of other constructions with predication in the English and Uzbek languages [Irimia M.A., 2012; Beklemesheva N.N., 2011; Kholikov H., 1993].

There are also some other types of SPCs in the modern English language the second components of which are expressed either by a noun or an adjective. They also have implicitly expressed predication, i.e. it is not expressed in the surface structure of a sentence. As a result of the analysis of such constructions, we have found another 5 SPCs in the modern English language. They are:

1. Subject + notional verb + *there to be* + identifier. For example: *I expect + there to be no argument about this* (Wells H., 2000). *Menimcha, bu yerda hech qanday e'tirozga o'rin yo'q.*

2. Subject + notional verb + *it* + adjective or noun + infinitive phrase: *I think it a pity (that) you did not try harder* (Taylor D., 2002). *Bu ishga jiddiyroq kirishmagan-ingizdan afsusdaman.*

3. Subject + conjugated verb + noun/pronoun + adjective: *The sun keeps us warm* (Wells H., 2000). *Quyosh bizni isitadi.*

4. Subject + conjugated verb + noun or pronoun + adjective: *He likes his coffee strong* (Truman M., 2000). *U kuchli (achchiq) kofeni yoqtiradi.*

5. Subject + conjugated verb + noun/pronoun + predicative: *They nominated him president* (Taylor D., 2002). *Ular uni prezidentlikka nomzod qilib ko'rsatishdi* (translations are ours).

These five constructions, which are formed without forms of verbs, express secondary predication, even though they are not as active as those formed with verb forms.

The verbs in the English and Uzbek SPCs have the meaning of expressing the predication in their semantics and this is reflected in these constructions. "Verbs of sense", "verbs of emotions" and other verbs in English and Uzbek, which can form such constructions, have limited potential of forming proposition when compared to some other languages. This is explained by the fact that these verbs have the meaning of turning from one state to another. The following table shows the amount of usage of specific verb groups in SPCs of the English and Uzbek languages:

№	Semantic groups of verbs	Absolute frequency of verbs	Relative frequency of verbs
1.	Verbs of sense	900	28%
2.	Causative verbs	804	25%
3.	Verbs of mental activity	611	19%
4.	Verbs of action	128	5%
5.	Verbs of state	118	4%
6.	Verbs belonging to other groups	609	19%
Total		3170	100%

Quantitative study of verb usage in SPCs of the English and Uzbek languages has shown the following results: Verbs in the above given 6 groups have different levels of usage. If the verbs of sense, causative verbs and verbs of mental activity are mostly used in such constructions (28%, 25% and 19% respectively), some semantic groups of verbs are used less in infinitival SPCs (e.g., motion verbs and verbs of state). This, in turn, proves the fact that not all the verbs are actively used in SPCs and that syntactic limitations play a major role here.

When SPCs are used after the verbs of sense perception, they verbalize the event discussed in the proposition and enrich their informativity. Verbs of sense perception are used at the primary stages of human cognition process. These verbs are followed by a complex event with an independent proposition, rather than a simple object.

Verbs of mental activity and causative verbs require another event to take place at a particular case and relevant causative verbs are used in order this event to occur. In other participial constructions information about the event, the duration of the action, the cause, and the conditions for the performance of the action is explicated.

One proposition in the English language is in all cases represented in the Uzbek language only with a relevant propositional structure. The English verb may have several equivalent verbs in Uzbek, depending on what semantics it is used. SPCs in Uzbek also can be expressed with the help of several verbs in English.

The time parameters for infinitive propositions can be determined by a transformational structure of a sentence structure, which is based on the tense aspect of a proposition. Sh. Rakhmatullayev gives the following example of implication of the timeless pattern of the verb form in the Uzbek language: *U uyidan chiqib ketdi, ammo o'zi bilan soyabonini olmadi* → *U uyidan soyabonini olmasdan chiqib ketmoqda* → *U uyidan soyabonini olmasdan chiqib ketdi* (Rakhmatullaev Sh., 2010). It is also possible to observe this in English translations of the above given sentences: *He went out and did not take an umbrella with him* → *He is going out without taking an umbrella with him; He went out without taking an umbrella with him* (translation is ours).

The propositional structure of infinitival SPCs in English and Uzbek differ from other constructions with the fact that an unrealized proposition in each infinitive can be expressed there. Therefore the number of propositions in the semantic structure of sentences is directly related to the number of actant verbs.

CONCLUSION

In sentences with SPCs in the English and Uzbek languages an event expressed with the help of a primary predicative construction and an event verbalized through a secondary predicative construction are united into one whole event. As a result of such unity, only one of them maintains the status of the main event, and the latter, verbalized with the help of SPCs, becomes a sub-event which loses its status as the main event. When two events are combined, one becomes the main event and another – a sub-event, and this is entirely dependent on a speaker's communicative intension and semantics of the verb. If the predicate of the sentence is expressed with the help of sense verbs, verbs of mental activity and causative verbs, then these verbs remain as the ones that represent the main event. Verbs that have other semantic meanings take the status of verbs that represent sub-events.

The structural and semantic features of SPCs in both languages have both similarities and differences. Similarities in their structure can be found in the participial constructions, but in other types there are more differences, rather than similarities. Semantically, SPCs in both languages serve for one purpose – to enrich the informativeness of the sentence, but their position in a sentence can be different in the discussed languages, as they belong to different language groups.

REFERENCES

1. Abdurakhmanov G. (1981) *The syntax of complicated sentence*. In the collection articles: The structure and history of Turkic languages. Moscow: Nauka.
2. Akimova G.N. (1981) *On the valency of transitive verbs in the Russian language // Theory of language. Methods of its analysis and teaching*. Leningrad: Visshaya shkola.
3. Arutyunova N.D. (1989) *Variations on the subject of a sentence*. In the collection articles: Invariant syntactic meanings and sentence structure. Moscow: Nauka.
4. Barkhudarov L.S. (2008) *The structure of a modern English simple sentence*. Moscow: Nauka.
5. Beklemesheva N.N. (2011) *Interpretation of secondary predicative constructions in the perspective of actual division of a sentence*. The dissertation abstract of the doctor of philological sciences. Moscow.
6. Chomsky N. (2002) *Syntactic Structures* (Second edition). Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
7. Furs L.A. (2005) *Cognitive aspects of the syntax of English simple sentence: Course book*. Tambov: Publishing house of TSU named after G.R. Derjavin.
8. Ilyenko S.G. (2003) *Personalization as the most important side of the category of predication // Russistics: selected works*. Saint Petersburg.: Publishing house of RSPU named after A.I. Gertsen. – P. 19-25.
9. Irimia M.A. (2012) *Secondary Predicates*. A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Toronto: Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto.
10. Jespersen O. (1983) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Part IV: Syntax. (Second edition) Third Volume, Time and Tense. Einar Munksgaard / George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
11. Khayrullaev M., Haqberdiev M. (1993) *Logics*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
12. Kholiqov H. (1993) *Complicated sentence of the modern Uzbek literary language its fea-*

- tures. The dissertation abstract of the candidate of philological sciences. Tashkent.
13. Labov W. (1998) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
 14. Litvin F.A. (1987) *Notes on the concept and term "predicativity" // Predication and polipredication*. Chelyabinsk: Publishing House of ChSPI.
 15. Mahmudov N. (1982) *Predication and polypredication // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*. Tashkent, volume 2. P. 18-21.
 16. Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A. (1995) *Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language (Syntax)*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
 17. Mamatov M. (1990) *Secondary predicate in the structure of simple sentence in the Uzbek language*. The dissertation abstract of the doctor of philological sciences. Tashkent.
 18. Nurmonov A., Mahmudov N. (1992) *Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
 19. Nurmonov A., Mahmudov N. and others. (1992) *Contextual syntax of the Uzbek language*. Tashkent: Fan.
 20. Pupinin Yu.A. (1992) *Impersonal predicate and subject-object relations in English // Problems of linguistics*. Moscow: Progress. – № 1. – P. 56-61.
 21. Rasulova M.I. (2005) *The basis of lexical categorization in linguistics*. Tashkent: Fan.
 22. Raxmatullaev Sh. (2010) *Present day Uzbek (book 1)*. Tashkent: Mumtoz so'z.
 23. Rosch E. (1978) *Principles of categorization // E. Rosch, B.B. Lloyd (eds.). Cognition and Categorization*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers. Pp. 27-48.
 24. Safarov Sh. (2006) *Cognitive linguistics*. Djizakh: Sangzor.
 25. Skrebtsova T.G. (2011) *Cognitive linguistics (A course of lectures)*. – S.Peterburg: Faculty of philology of SpbSU.
 26. Sweet H. (1998) *A New English Grammar (5-th edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 27. Parsons Terence. (1990) *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in the Sub-atomic Semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
 28. Ungerer F., Schmid H.J. (1996) *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. – London: Longman.
 29. Yakubov J. (2006) *The features of the expression of the category of modality in logics and linguistics*. The dissertation abstract of the doctor of philological sciences. Tashkent.
 30. Yuldashev A.N. (1977) *Ratio of participial and personal verb forms in Turkic languages*. Moscow: Nauka.

THE LIST OF USED FICTION

1. Christie A. (2006) *The ABC Murders*. Oxford: Oxford publishing house.
2. Crane S. (2004) *The Red Badge of Courage*. London: Penguin books.
3. Qahhor A. (1989) *Selected works (In five volumes. Volume 1)*. Tashkent: G'ofur Gulom.
4. Taylor D. Mildred (2002). *Roll of Thunder, Hear my Cry*. Oxford: Oxford publishing house.
5. Truman M. (2004) *Murder on Capitol Hill*. Oxford: Oxford publishing house.
6. Wells H. (2007) *The Passionate Friends*. Moscow: Cornet.

FOYDALANILGAN ADABIYOTLAR

1. Abdurakhmanov G. (1981) *Sintaksis oslojnyonnogo predlojeniya*. V sbornike: Struktura i istoriya tyurkskix yazikov. Moskva: Nauka.
2. Akimova G.N. (1981) *K voprosu o valentnosti perexodnix glagolov v russkom yazike // Teoriya yazika. Metodi yego issledovaniya i prepodavaniya*. Leningrad: Visshaya shkola.
3. Arutyunova N.D. (1989) *Variatsiya na temu predlojeniya*. V sbornike: Invariantniye sintaksicheskiye znacheniya i struktura predlojenya. Moskva: Nauka.
4. Barkhudarov L.S. (2008) *Struktura prostogo predlojeniya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazika*. Moskva: Nauka.
5. Beklemesheva N.N. (2011) *Interpretatsiya vtorichno-predikativnix struktur v perspective aktualnogo chleneniya*. Avtoreferat dissertatsii doktora filologicheskix nauk. Moskva.
6. Chomsky N. (2002) *Syntactic Structures (Second edition)*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de

- Gruyter.
7. Furs L.A. (2005) *Kognitivniye aspekti sintaksisa angliyskogo prostogo predlojeniya*: Uchebnoye posobiye. Tambov: Izdatelstvo TGU imeni G.R. Derjavina.
 8. Ilyenko S.G. (2003) *Personalizatsiya kak vajneyshaya storona kategorii predikativnosti* // Rusistika: izbranniye trudi. SPb.: Izdatelstvo RGPU imeni A.I. Gertsena. – P. 19-25.
 9. Irimia M.A. (2012) *Secondary Predicates*. A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Toronto: Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto.
 10. Jespersen O. (1983) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Part IV: Syntax. (Second edition) Third Volume, Time and Tense. Einar Munksgaard / George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
 11. Khayrullaev M., Haqberdiev M. (1993) *Mantiq*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
 12. Kholiqov H. (1993) *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tilida murakkablashgan sodda gaplar uslubi-yati*. Filologiya fanlari nomzodi dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati. Toshkent.
 13. Labov W. (1998) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
 14. Litvin F.A. (1987) *Zametki o ponyatii I termine "Predikativnost"* // Predikativnost i polipredikativnost. Chelyabinsk: Izdatelstvo ChGPI.
 15. Mahmudov N. (1982) *Predikatsiya va polupredikatsiya* // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. Toshkent, 2-son. B. 18-21.
 16. Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A. (1995) *O'zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi (Sintaksis)*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
 17. Mamatov M. (1990) *Vtorichniy predikat v structure prostogo predlojeniya uzbekskogo yazika*. Avtoreferat dissertatsii doktora filologicheskix nauk. Tashkent.
 18. Nurmonov A., Mahmudov N. (1992) *O'zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
 19. Nurmonov A., Mahmudov N. va boshqalar. (1992) *O'zbek tilining mazmuniy sintaksisi*. Toshkent: Fan.
 20. Pupinin Yu.A. (1992) *Bezlichniy predikat i subyektno-obyektniye otnoshniya va angliyskom yazike* // Voprosi yazikoznaniya. Moskva: Progress. – № 1. – S. 56-61.
 21. Rasulova M.I. (2005) *Osnovi leksicheskoy kategorizatsii v lingvistike*. Tashkent: Fan.
 22. Raxmatullaev Sh. (2010) *Hozirgi zamon o'zbek tili (1-kitob)*. Toshkent: Mumtoz so'z.
 23. Rosch E. (1978) *Principles of categorization* // E. Rosch, B.B. Lloyd (eds.). Cognition and Categorization. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers. Pp. 27-48.
 24. Safarov Sh. (2006) *Kognitiv tilshunoslik*. Jizzax: Sangzor.
 25. Skrebtsova T.G. (2011) *Kognitivnaya lingvistika (Kurs leksiy)*. – S.Peterburg: Filologicheskii fakultet SpbGU.
 26. Sweet H. (1998) *A New English Grammar* (5-th edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 27. Parsons Terence. (1990) *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in the Sub-atomic Semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
 28. Ungerer F., Schmid H.J. (1996) *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. – London: Longman.
 29. Yakubov J. (2006) *Modallik kategoriyasining mantiq va tilda ifodalanish xususiyatlari*. Filologiya fanlari nomzodi dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati. Toshkent.
 30. Yuldashev A.N. (1977) *Sootnosheniye deeprichastnix i lichnix form glagola v tyurkskix yazikax*. Moskva: Nauka.

FOYDALANILGAN BADIY ADABIYOTLAR

1. Christie A. (2006) *The ABC Murders*. Oxford: Oxford publishing house.
2. Crane S. (2004) *The Red Badge of Courage*. London: Penguin books.
3. Qahhor A. (1989) *Asarlar (Besh jildlik. Birinchi jild)*. Toshkent: G'ofur Gulom.
4. Taylor D. Mildred (2002). *Roll of Thunder, Hear my Cry*. Oxford: Oxford publishing house.
5. Truman M. (2004) *Murder on Capitol Hill*. Oxford: Oxford publishing house.
6. Wells H. (2007) *The Passionate Friends*. Moscow: Cornet.