

## PREDICATIVE RELATIONS IN LINGUISTICS

*Boymatova Muhabbat Omonaliyevna*

*Student of ENG-IU-20-group, Faculty of World Languages,  
Namangan State University, Chortok district,  
Namangan region*

**Abstract:** Linguistics or Linguistics is a science that studies languages. There are practical and theoretical types of linguistics, and theoretical linguistics studies the structure (grammar) and its meaning (semantics) of language. Grammar includes the disciplines of morphology (the structure and change of words), syntax (the rules for joining words into phrases and sentences), and phonology (the study of language using abstract sounds). Applied linguistics mainly deals with the practical application of theoretical knowledge learned in linguistics. Applied linguistics includes learning and teaching foreign languages.

**Key words:** Linguistics, predicative relation, language, science, grammar.

Linguistics, "Linguistics" is a science about language, its social nature, function, internal structure, classification, laws of operation (activity) of specific languages, historical development. According to its purpose and task, there are several directions (fields) of linguistics: general linguistics is a field that studies language as a phenomenon characteristic of a person in general, the main task of which is to identify and clarify the most general characteristics of the languages of the world; private linguistics is a field that studies some characteristics of a language; applied linguistics is a direction that develops methods for solving practical problems related to language use (experimental phonetics, lexicography, linguostatistics, transcription, transliteration, etc.); mathematical linguistics, structural linguistics, comparative-historical linguistics and other fields such as paralinguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics study language features related to the activity of the speaker (person) in society. when defined, and at the same time defined as having as its object "the reference of the content of the sentence to the truth," it is clear that here we simply substitute. it is clearly visible from the fact that "predicativeness" is shown as the main sign of the sentence in the works. If "predicativeness" is really only a "proposition" in this sense of the word, i.e. [6] If a sentence really has a new and, moreover, essential feature, then it is natural to replace the new solution found in the definition of the sentence, to label it as "unity with predicativeness" or something similar, and all other waiver of definitions. It is evident that such definitions are not clearly given to show the emptiness and uselessness of the word "predicative" when used in this way.(Indeed: "a proposition is a proposition, its main feature is a

proposition!"), it is impossible to say. relation" or "property of the predicate") is hardly a correct word. The fact is that predicativeness in this sense of the word can be characteristic not only for the predicate, but also for the members of the sentence or their elements, which are not predicates in the correct sense of the word. A predicative relationship or predicativeness in this sense of the word, for example, is typical for a "predicative" definition, for a "predicative" element of a complex object (English I see him come), for a "predicative" element. So, predicativeness is Although it means "property of predicativeness" or "predicativeness", it is not covered by the concept of predicate. Therefore, in this sense, "predicability" and "predicability" are not empty words. In this sense, the word "predicativeness" is used below. Are there any sentences that are absolutely not predicative in this sense of the word? Yes, of course. If the sentence does not contain a predicate or any other member similar to it, then it is clear that there is no predicativeness. So, of course, for example, "Fire!", "Thunder!", "My God!", "Happy journey!", "Ivan Ivanovich!", "Hustle, tears, requests", " Autumn, evening" and others, that is: in sentences A.A. Shakhmatov calls it "an indescribable subject". Term A.A. And Shakhmatova is very sad, because she creates the impression that there is a subject in these sentences. At the same time, it is clear that if there is no predicate in the sentence, then there can be no talk about the subject. If the subject is the member of the sentence in the predicative relationship, then without the predicate, naturally, it cannot be either the member in the predicative relationship or the predicative relationship itself.[4] It is more correct to call such proposals "non-predicative". The characteristic point is that it is impossible to determine the connection with the sentence in these sentences. Indeed, "Fire!" to express the content of the sentence, etc. absolutely impossible in the form of judgment. Any separation of the content of such a sentence into subject and predicate (for example: "I see fire" or "There is a fire", etc.) destroys the main content of this sentence, that is, the thing that makes up the sentence. The uniqueness of its essence - its emphasized indivisibility - and introduces what it does not have - a logical segmentation that is impossible in sentences of this type. Unfortunately, logicians often do not take this into account and take for the content of such sentences something that they do not have at all. After all, we know that the word "fire" is a sentence only because of the intonation with which this word is pronounced (in the letter, this intonation can be suggested by the appropriate punctuation mark or context). It is a certain intonation that makes sentences. [3] In other words, these are sentences made only with intonation. Meanwhile, in a sentence with a predicate, it will undoubtedly cause the sentence to be understood as a sentence (this is, of course, why predicate or predicativeness, i.e. explains that the predicate property is accepted, of course, of course , error, always to make the sentence a sentence). In fact, phrases like "the bird flew away" or "the wall is white" cannot be sentences because they contain predicates. These phrases are sentences with any

intonation. In other words, it is impossible to give such intonation to these phrases that they are not sentences. We use these phrases not because they are pronounced with a certain intonation (it goes without saying that they have one or another intonation in speech), in particular, because they are pronounced with "message intonation", but as a sentence we accept. Because they have a predicate. Thus, these are sentences made not by intonation, but by a certain internal structure. But the presence of the predicate also indicates the presence or predicability of the main clause. Therefore, these sentences can also be called "predicative". Apparently, "predicative" sentences are those whose content can always be expressed by means of judgments and usually do not even require interpretation to reveal their logical content. So, "the bird is flying", "the wall is white", etc. There can be judgments. But the fact that predicativeness turns a sentence into a sentence does not mean that predicativeness always turns the phrase it comes from into a sentence. Thus, the predicative nature of one of the components of a complex object (it can be called a "predicate of a complex object") does not make this object a whole sentence. Even the predicative nature of the predicate does not always turn the sentence into a sentence, because the predicate is possible in something that is not a sentence, but only one part of it, the predicate, as you know, is possible (and even necessary) in the so-called "subordinate" sentences, that is: it is clear that the sentence is not a complete sentence, and only parts that are mistakenly called "sentence". Therefore, there is no connection between predicativeness and sentence. The existence of a predicate, that is: it is impossible to predict an important feature of propositions. There may be no predicativeness in a sentence, but there may be predicativeness where there is no sentence. On the contrary, there is no doubt that there is a direct connection between predicativeness and judgment. The presence of a predicate (that is, predicativeness) in a sentence indicates the ability of this sentence to express a judgment.[2] Predicativeness or predicative relationship is, in essence, undoubtedly, in logic, the relationship between the subject of judgment and the predicate. It will be more clear if we differ by . For example: "The forest is green" (where "green" is the nominal predicate) and "The forest is green!" (here there is no predicate, and here only the intonation of exclamation etc. indicates that it is a sentence). In the first sentence there is that mental element, thanks to which the relations of reality are actively unfolded, as it were, by thought, but in the second sentence there is no such mental element.

However, although predicativeness or predicative relationship refers to the relationship between the subject and the predicate of the sentence, it is not without reason that this relationship is called the second of these members (predicate). The point is that it is the second of the terms in predicative relation, i.e. a predicate or a term similar to it expresses this relation (of course, this is precisely why we need a



word that calls a predicate relation a property of a predicate, that is, the word "predicateness". or "predicateness"). [1]

### **Conclusion:**

Apparently, this is the main difference between the subject and the predicate of the sentence and the predicate of the sentence. That this is indeed the case, in particular, cases where there are no formal differences between the two members of the sentence in the predicative relationship, for example, when a linking verb connects two members, each of which has its own - manifests itself.

### **References:**

1. Demyankov V. 3. Concept of predicates and semantic interpretation. (About the problem of predicative attitude) / Izv. USSR Academy of Sciences, Ser. Leah. 1980. V. 39[1]
2. M. I. Steblin-Kamensky, "On predicability", Vestn. 1956. No. 20. [2]
3. Steblin-Kamensky M.I. Controversial in linguistics. 1974. [3]
4. Stepanov Yu.S. Names. Predicates. Offers, Moscow 1981.[4]
5. Бархударов Л.С. Очерки по морфологии современного английского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, 1975. –113-116 с.[5]
6. Бушлаев Ф.И. Историческая грамматика русского языка. – Москва Наука, 1968. – 8 с.[6]
7. Виноградов В.В. Избранные труды. Исследования по русской грамматике. – Москва Наука, 1975. – 282 с.[7]