

**FUNCTIONAL SEMANTICS OF THE STRUCTURE OF SECONDARY PREDICATION IN
THE LITERARY DISCOURSE (ON THE MATERIAL OF ENGLISH AND
KARAKALPAK LANGUAGES)**

Jumag'aliev Jalg'asbay Mirzag'alievich

*A second-year masters' degree student at the department of English Linguistics,
Karakalpakistan State University named after Berdakh*

Scientific Supervisor: Kuldashev A

Abstract: *Predication is typically thought of as a (linguistic) semantic notion: the construction of a proposition from two components, a subject and a predicate. Syntactically, this corresponds to the idea that a clause – or any other structure that will be interpreted as a proposition – has an essentially bipartite structure.[1:14]*

Keywords: *predicative expression, periphrastic predicates, recitatives, Subject-oriented*

INTRODUCTION

Predication is commonly regarded as a (linguistic) semantic concept, which involves building a proposition out of two parts—a subject and a predicate. The primary methods that predication has been examined in the generative syntactic literature are outlined in this chapter. We're just talking about 'main' prediction here. Edwin Williams wrote one of the key texts on the grammar of predication. Prediction, in Williams' view, is a kind of "role assignment." The necessity to evoke a notion of predication separate from theta-role assignment is arguably best supported by expletives or pleonastic subjects. Williams, Rothstein, and John Bowers' groundbreaking work served as an inspiration for the predication syntax. As a syntactic licensing relation, prediction did not fit well into prior generative frameworks. The Minimalists' rejection of D-structure has made it possible for the idea of predication to be more effectively incorporated into syntactic theory as a whole.[2:56]

The absence of an a priori definition of the phenomena of secondary predication is the biggest issue with it, however there are other issues as well. As a result, we must make do without the criteria for determining whether evidence counts as a priori expressing the phenomena and instead focus on the goals and assertions of linguistics. The purpose of introducing linguistic terminology is to suggest that it is supported by some intriguing linguistic generalization. The standard practice when dealing with secondary predication is to give several instances and refer to them as secondary predicates. Of course, there must be a core that makes sense. We want to go over the essentials in this section and begin by going over some history. We shall first define the boundaries of the current work. Only secondary predicates based on nouns, adjectives, or prepositional phrases are taken into consideration. Additional issues are presented by other categories on their own. Once more, we begin by imitating Nichols. The

abbreviations "instr," "acc," "dat," and "nom" denote the word's instrumental, accusative, dative, and nominative cases, respectively. We'll start by talking about secondary predication's syntax. The purpose of is to explain the instrumental case form and the syntactic relations that play a role in how sentences with secondary predication should be interpreted. A broad formal construction of an inferential context-dependent semantics is presented . We then use this evolution to provide the main instances of secondary predication in Russian (the depictives) .[3:87]

In this section, which serves as the paper's primary contribution, we go over the reasons why resultative secondary predication does not exist in Russian. Additionally, it covers the topic of incorporating other Russian instrument usage into this treatment. A concise overview is provided. We must thus describe the syntactic relation it is linked to as well as the proximity domain of its assignment in order to take the instrumental into account in secondary predication.

We will argue that two separate characteristics of the case assigner are responsible for the two types of case assignment to secondary predicates. Congruent case is also partially the result of subject-predicate agreement.

We'll also make the case for why the congruent instance is prohibited having a partly syntactic basis. The ideas presented here are largely modifications of other concepts. We presuppose the syntactic structure described in Chomsky's 2000 paper. There, it is recommended that the framework be utilized to develop theories rather than to be taken as a complete, formal statement. Since the document lacks answers in certain places, we will have to offer alternatives; nevertheless, we do not guarantee that these are the best options available. The cited paper's simplistic framework does away with the idea of trees serving as the theoretical framework's structural skeleton. If at all, they should only be utilized for explanatory purposes. To avoid using tree geometry, any syntactic relations that are pertinent to phonological/phonetic or semantic features are described in other ways. Two subacts, as well as a number of operators and functions that further define those subacts and how they interact, are contained in the act of utterance the train has come. The phrase "has arrived" on the one hand reflects a predication subact in which the speaker attributes arrival to an entity and a variety of predication operators (Present, Perfect) that change that subact of predication. The words "the train" on the other hand represent a subact of reference in which the speaker refers to the object whose arrival is attributed as well as a variety of operators (Definite, Specific, Singular) and functions (Processed, Subject, Topic). In this specific instance, the speaker believes that a further (sub) subact of predication best supports the subact of reference. If she had stated that it had arrived. The differences between various semantic functions of initial arguments are not conveyed morphologically in English, and this is true not just of the predicates we just studied but also generally. Their co-occurrence potential with adverbs (such as Agent with cautiously, Agent, Force, or Processed with rhythmically, etc.) must be used as proof for their presence. The

difference between "falling on purpose" and "falling accidentally" can only be stated in English by adding the word "inadvertently." [4:98]

The second thing the predicate frame will have is a declaration of the category, or "part of speech" (Hengeveld 1992), that the predicate falls under. The emic distinctions that need to be made in this case are those that apply to the language under consideration. Hengeveld (1992) demonstrated that languages draw differentially from the thematic categories of "Verb, Noun, Adjective, and Adverb," such that a language that has one category also has the categories listed to the left; no language, for example, will have an adjective without a noun. It implies that there will be languages that solely use verbs; in fact, Hengeveld has named the Tuscarora language (among others) as one of these; in such a language, there are no syntactic categories at all. As a result, a predicate may be followed by an infinite number of related reference expressions, at least in some language types. However, according to FG, only a small subset of these—up to three—have argument status, with the others all being satellites. Every theory that has presented such a contrast has been troubled by the shaky line between arguments and satellites, and FG is no exception. One issue is that textual analysis has revealed that many predicates that were previously believed to have a specific number of arguments frequently occur with one or more of these being left unexplained. Take a look at the following illustration of theirs, which is taken from a television program in which A asks B for his opinion of her work on his house. [5:87]

Because they participate in two (possibly syntactic) interactions, secondary predicates provide a problem for syntactic theories. The first connection is typically seen as an example of adjunction to a V projection. Since the secondary predicate attributes a condition or state to the controller, this analysis does not immediately capture the second, predicative link between the secondary predicate and one of the arguments of the main predicate (referred to as the controller or antecedent). It is assumed that there is a definite and unambiguous separation between secondary predicates and adverbials in order to model the predicative relationship between the secondary predicate and one of the main predicate's arguments as a syntactic relationship. Although the adjunct status and argument-oriented character of *alive* in instances like (1) and (2) seem to be equally evident, it turns out that separating secondary predicate constructions from technically and semantically comparable constructions may be difficult from a cross-linguistic perspective. No agreement appears to have been established on universal restrictions on depictive secondary predicates or on syntactic representations that are valid across language boundaries. Even if one removes the phenomena encompassed by the wider meanings of the word described, this is owing to the dual character of secondary predicates, the challenges of defining the phenomenon, and the cross-linguistic heterogeneity of its manifestations. A number of hotly debated topics in research on the syntax of adverbs and secondary predicates, such as the placement of secondary predicates in the syntactic hierarchy and the nature of the predicative

relationship, may be affected by the range of phenomena that should be taken into account as depictives. Subject-oriented adverbs and depictives have been used in particular to analyze the nature of prediction.

CONCLUSION

Functional structure is the familiar from classic grammatical descriptions abstract functional syntactic arrangement of the sentence that represents syntactic predicate-argument structure and functional interactions like subject and object. It explains the rationale behind the categories and data in functional structure, outlines some common traits of those categories, and shows that it is preferable to treat grammatical functions as basic concepts, as they are in LFG, as opposed to defining them in terms of morphological or phrase structure concepts. It demonstrates that it is ideal to express syntactic sub categorization requirements—the variety of syntactic arguments that a predicate requires—in functional terms. Discussions are had over the formal representation of functional structure (f-structure) and restrictions placed on f-structure representations. Finally, it gives a summary of the information contained in and how f-structure characteristics are represented.

REFERENCES:

1. Arnold I.V. Lexicology of modern English: Textbook. For in-tov and fak. Foreign language - 3rd ed., rev. and additional - m.: Higher. shk., 1986.
2. Berlison S.B., Specificity of the semantics of phraseological units and the role of structural components in its definition // semantic structure of words and phraseological units: collection of articles. Scientific articles - Ryazan, 1980. Zhukov V.P. Semantics of phraseological turns. - M., 1978.
3. Kunin A.V. The basic concepts of phraseology as a linguistic discipline and the creation of the English-Russian phraseological dictionary: author. dis. Dr. philol. Sciences - M., 1964.
4. Kunin A.V., Course of phraseology of modern English, uch. manual, 2nd edition - M, High School, 1996. - P. 381
5. Erdanova S.A., Diyorova N.O., Tukboeva M.B., Kakhkhorova Sh. T., Khakimova D.Y., Jurayeva Z.I. The role of foreign language in modern society. PJAE, 18 (8) 2021.