How to Cite:

Bolibekova, M. M., Abdurakhimova, N. A., Toshtemirova, A. S., & Abduqakharov, Q. A. (2022). Philosophical and methodological bases of **predicate** and sentence interpretation in formal linguistics. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *6*(S2), 512-528. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v6nS2.2170

Philosophical and Methodological Bases of Predicate and Sentence Interpretation in Formal Linguistics

Mavjuda M. Bolibekova

National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Noila A. Abdurakhimova

National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Adiba S. Toshtemirova

National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Qobiljon A. Abduqakharov

National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract---Philosophical and methodological bases of predicate and sentence interpretation in formal linguistics. Now it remains to answer the question of which of these units - logical units or linguistic units - is more scientifically older. Science has already answered this question - linguistics (broader philology) was separated from the structure of philosophy only in the XVIII century, that is, linguistic definitions were copied from philosophy - from logic. This can be proved by another incident. This section of our work can be concluded with the following general conclusion: In Uzbek formal linguistics, the interpretation of the position of the predicate in the sentence structure was given not based on the internal (native, ontological) features of the Uzbek language, but based on the understanding of the predicate in Russian formal linguistics. In formal linguistics itself, the interpretation of the predicate is based on the understanding of the logical predicate.

Keywords---formal linguistics, logical units, methodological bases, philosophical bases, sentence interpretation.

Introduction

In formal linguistics, in Western European and Slavic languages, the principles, concepts, and categories of formal logic, rather than purely grammatical (linguistic), served as the epistemological basis in determining the position of the predicate (the main parts of speech) in sentence construction. There is a number of arguments to support this. Including:

- Cases in which the terms subject and predicate, which are logical categories, are possessed and used as alternatives to the terms predicate. In this respect, Russian linguistics and Uzbek linguistics, which developed under its influence, are in a much better position, because in these linguistics the terms podlejashchee-skazuemoe, possessive participle differ from the terms of logical subject-predicate. In Germanism and Romanistics, in both fields both in logic and linguistics the same term subject-predicate pair is used and causes a lot of inconveniences (Lyons, 1968).
- The subject is seen as the absolute ruling piece. Linguistically, this principle is completely unfounded and derived from logic. Indeed, a subject whose logical object is related to the idea of existence as a real individual consists of a set of its own attributes (Voishvillo & Degtyarev, 1998), - the subject itself combines and synthesizes attributes, and the "set of adjectives and adjectives" (adjectives, adjectives, functions) has a reality as an independent being (Shirinova, 2017). Therefore, logical judgment is always an expression of two-syllable sentences, even one-syllable sentences in Slavic languages (Saidova, 1996). The linguistic invalidity of this principle is proved, first of all, by the presence of one-syllable sentences in the language and by the fact that it is a normative condition. Although this was emphasized by A.M. Peshkovsky in his time (Peshkovsky, 1956), he could not exclude from linguistics that this principle - of course, the two peaks of speech and the subject 's interpretation as the absolute ruler in the construction of speech modern Indo-European languages (including Slavic languages) there was no great need for it to be built; after all, this family does not know one-syllable sentences from modern languages except Slavic languages.
- Placement of derivative terms in linguistics, such as predictive, predicative construction, non-predictive construction. There can be no objection to these terms in themselves - they are very pertinent and should be used in linguistics. But predicative (predicative relation) is essentially a linguistic phenomenon and a concept when the intersection is equated with the possessive-intersectional relationship, mixing logic and grammar (based on the principle of "Weak in the face of oppression is always guilty" expressed by I.A. Krylov in his time with laughter) begins the suppression of logic in grammar. One of the reasons for this is that in Indo-European languages the subject-predicate structure of logical sentences is often consistent with the possessive- predicate relation, He took off his hat, it began to rain, which is used as a Russian humorous phrase in these languages. - When he took off his hat, it rained. or Russian normative prochitannaya mnoyu kniga - a book I read, German normative akkuzativus com infinitivus (infinitive with infinitive) (Admoni, 1973), Ich sehe die Kinder spielen - I see children playing. / I see the kids playing.; Du hörtest den Mann rufen - You heard a man calling / You heard a man calling. With the relatively infrequent use of such devices and the fact that such devices have a logical predicative connection, it is

unthinkable for anyone to accept and interpret them as speech – the fact that in Indo-European languages it is possible to have an indefinite participle (not having personal/numerical forms) is inconceivable and illogical. That is why European linguistics can and does work with ease, equating predicative/predicative connection with possessive.

Methods

The basis of the reliance on the principles of formal logic in formal linguistics is determined, first, by the fact that science - linguistics has developed on the basis of logical grammar, which grew out of philosophy, more precisely, logic, on the other hand, the methodological basis of the empirical cognitive stage is always determined by the fact that it is formal logic (Kedrov, 1963). Indeed, the method of synchronous description of modern languages (formal linguistics), formed in the second half of the XIX century, developed in the direction of logical grammar (universal grammar), which became popular in the XVII-XVIII centuries (Zvegintsev, 1985). Therefore, in determining the essence of the sentence, the exact essence of the predicate of the sentence was copied. The truth is clarified by comparing the following definitions of grammatical possessive and grammatical section (a) and logical subject and logical predicate (b): a) "The subject is the main member of the sentence, grammatically independent of the other members of the sentence, ... denoting an object, ... the sign of which is determined in the predicate"; "The predicate is the main member of the sentence, grammatically dependent on the subject, ... denoting the sign of the subject that is expressed by the subject".

"The main parts of a simple judgment are: one or more subjects (logical subjects), ... expressing objects about which something in the statement is affirmed or denied. Secondly, the predicate of the judgment (logical predicate) is the part of the judgment that expresses what is being asserted (or denies) ... about the subject (Voishvillo & Degtyarev, 1998), " If we compare the definitions given to logical units (subject and predicate) and linguistic units (possessive and definite), it is not difficult to make sure that they are almost identical. Now it remains to answer the question of which of these units - logical units or linguistic units - is more scientifically older. Science has already answered this question - linguistics (broader philology) was separated from the structure of philosophy only in the XVIII century, that is, linguistic definitions were copied from philosophy - from logic. This can be proved by another incident. The logical definition given in section b) above is taken from a book compiled under the guidance of E.K. Voishvillo and published as a textbook. If we compare this definition with the logical subject and predicate given by a scientist two hundred years ago and even Aristotle, who lived in BC, we see that they are exactly the same. Moreover, in logic textbooks written in Uzbek, Arabic, or dozens of other languages, the definition of subject and predicate is essentially the same and does not differ significantly. Let's compare: «PREDICATE - 1) in logic... one of the two terms of the sentence (predicate and subject); logical section, i.e. the part informing about the subject in the sentence...; 2) in linguistics - predicate "; «SUBJECT -... a term of logic denoting the object of judgment. In grammatical traditions, "S." the term is used to denote a piece of speech that corresponds to the subject of a judgment (opinion). The term is left unclear in Western European syntactic terminology; In Russian grammar, its shield is "podlejashchee", and in Uzbek, the semantic shield of the Russian term ("possessed") is used". All this shows that logical terms are older than grammatical (linguistic) terms. The description of "subject" from UzME also emphasizes that the grammatical term is a logical term.

It should be noted that the linguistic definitions we quoted above served as a n a m u n a for almost the entire former Soviet Union in the 1950s and 1960s. N.Ya. Marr's pseudo-Marxist and fictitious Japhethic teachings in linguistics in 1940-50 (Usmonov, 1972), In the face of this scientific grammar of the Russian language, the task was to free our science from the shackles of Marxism and to "set it on a truly scientific basis". For almost 30 years, the slightest withdrawal from the "holy book" of linguistics was a state crime (Snow, 2009). The complete formation of modern Uzbek linguistics as an independent science dates back to this period (Nurmonov, 2002). Therefore, every textbook and manual, scientific work, and dissertation research created in this period, which is directly related to the name and activity of Professor Ayyub Gulyamov, began with obtaining a scientific quotation (methodological principle) from this "holy book" and such a follow-up. lasted almost until the 1980s. Here are some examples:

"Judgment consists of a combination of subject and predicate. Speech, on the other hand, usually arises from the possessive and the participle relation" (Abdurahmonov et al., 1979). "It is said that the sentence has an absolute ruling part in the form of a general agreement, in which the judgment is directed, the thought goes on about itself, and the sign is determined by the predicate. The possessive is the dominant part of a two-syllable sentence. The subject forms a composition with subordinate parts. The participle in possessive verbs often indicates the executor - the logical subject " (Abdurahmonov et al., 1979).

Results

"The predicate is the expression of a sign in a predicative connection. The lexical meaning of adjectives is also an idea of a sign. Therefore, the possibility of using adjectives in the function of a predicate is wide. If an adjective is in an attributive connection with a word expressing an object (name), then in a sentence it can enter into a predicative connection with any word or combination of words used in the function of the subject".

The organization of the predicate, whether the sentence is simple or compound, and the interpretation of the sentence structure, in general, were determined in formal linguistics (in its Russian and Uzbek versions) on the principle of absolute domination of the subject. So when I say, I do; such products as a cohesive predicate simple sentence, I say, as a consonant simple sentence, I say, do; as I said, the derivatives like you do have been described as a compound sentence.

This section of our work can be concluded with the following general conclusion: In Uzbek formal linguistics, the interpretation of the position of the predicate in the sentence structure was given not on the basis of the internal (native, ontological) features of the Uzbek language, but on the basis of the understanding of the predicate in Russian formal linguistics. In formal linguistics itself, the interpretation of the predicate is based on the understanding of the logical predicate. Abdurauf Fitrat started our science as the beginning of the formal

interpretation and did not popularize the Uzbek interpretation of the predicate as the absolute dominant part of the sentence, but the term predicate, introduced by this selfless and highly talented scientist, is firmly established (Peniro & Cyntas, 2019; Borris & Zecho, 2018; Jing, 2017; Suryasa et al., 2019).

The founders of Uzbek formal linguistics A.Gulamov and M. Askarova, the achievements of Uzbek formal linguistics, which analyzed the structure of speech from the point of view of centralization, continued the Uzbek substantial interpretation of the problem from the point of view of centralism, and G. Abdurahmanov supplemented it.

Predicate and sentence in Uzbek substantial linguistics

Unlike Uzbek formal linguistics, Uzbek substantial linguistics began with the question of the methodology of linguistic research. In the words of Ozod Sharafiddinov, the Uzbek language devotee (Hamraeva, 2012), Professor S.N. Ivanov raised it in the late 1950s. In his dissertation on "Syntactic functions of forms in modern soviet literary language", which he defended in 1957 at the Academic Council of Leningrad University, he eclectically copied the principles of Russian formal grammatical analysis in the interpretation of the structure of Turkic languages, Condemning the principle of evaluating the Uzbek language system by Russian norms, he raised the issue of the need for an objective approach to the source and its interpretation as it is (Ivanov, 1959). In the following years, S.N. Ivanov deepened his research and defended his doctoral dissertation on the basis of complementing the methods of system-structural analysis of language (mainly Prague structuralism, functional linguistics) with dialectical principles applied consciously and consistently. l-Gazi-Khana. Grammatic essay. In his monograph [25] he formed the substantial foundations of the study of language structure. In the works of SN Ivanov's followers, these principles were improved (Qurbonova, 2001), each principle of substantive analysis was explained in detail (Sayfullayev et al., 2009), applied to the practical analysis of lexical, morphological, syntactic units of the Uzbek language, reflected in textbooks and manuals, that is, it has risen to the level of formed and practiced teaching.

The purely linguistic and philosophical-epistemological foundations of substantial analysis have been studied and described in detail in Uzbek linguistics, as mentioned above. M.Abuzalova's monograph "Substantial morphology, valence and interpretation of sentence structure" is complete, the first part of the textbook "Modern Uzbek language..." written by the same author, consisting of 6 points, is devoted to this issue. The textbook "Methods, methodology, methods of linguistic research" by H.G. Nematov and Sh. Khamroeva also focuses on the discussion of this issue, including in the section of the manual entitled "Problems of the practical application of the methodology of scientific dialectical research":

- Who is this girl?
- My aunt.

Used in dialogic speech "My aunt." The linguistic (verbal) occurrence of the 16 principles of gnoseological analysis of dialectics in the interpretation of speech, forms of possession, some phrases is described and an example of its description by a linguist is given. Therefore, the above-mentioned doctoral dissertation of M.

Kurbanova and the textbook "Modern Uzbek language (Materials for simple speech syntax)" contain 5 pure linguistic descriptions of the described substantive analysis, and in the textbook of H. Nematov, Sh. Khamroeva, This monograph by M. Abuzalova "1.4. How to study something on the basis of a substantive approach?" we will confine ourselves to quoting the 16 dialectical principles explained in a paragraph.

The principles of 16 epistemological-methodological types of research of dialectical interpretation are as follows:

The content of the principles

- That something is a real (objective, independent) individuality;
- That something is a set of relationships;
- Things are changing and evolving;
- Internal contradictions in something;
- The thing as a whole of contradictions (contradictions);
- The occurrence of opposing parties;
- Unit of analysis (analysis) and synthesis (generalization);
- The infinity of the relation of a thing to other things;
- The reflection of things;
- Infinity of relations of things;
- The infinity of deepening into the essence of something;
- Unlimited disclosure of object connections;
- Repetition of previous stages in the development phase;
- To be as old as before as a result of the denial of denial;
- Update form while maintaining content;
- Transition of quantitative changes to qualitative changes (Sayfullayev et al., 2009).

The principles of the pure linguistic research of substantive research are:

- the substantive nature of linguistic unity;
- that each linguistic unit belongs to at least two linguistic paradigms;
- the absoluteness of the 'intermediate third' in all links of the linguistic system;
- hierarchical (hierarchical) construction of the linguistic system, in which the interconnection of the members of each compound with hypo-hyperonymic relations as an open microsystem;
- the ability of each linguistic unit dominant to have its own open specific synonymous, hyponymic, graduonymic, partonymic, antonymic environments, and that these private environments are not directly related to the general linguistic system and microsystems only dominant from lower to higher (Kurbanova et al., 2021).

Uzbek substantial linguistics was formed and is developing on the basis of the principles of such analysis. Now, in this method of analysis, we will focus on the interpretation of the sentence and its study (Salton et al., 1990; Duffley, 2021; Bickerton, 2007; Volf, 2020).

It should be noted that the above-mentioned candidate and doctoral dissertations of S.N. Ivanov, followers of the scientist H. Nematov, V.A. Guzev, and others, recognized as the theoretical basis of substantive analysis in our science, The monographs, scientific articles, and reports published on the basis of these studies did not specifically address the issue of predicate and its structure - these researchers in Turkic linguistics focused on the methodology of linguistic research, including:

- first of all, it is necessary to avoid describing it on the basis of scientific interpretation of European (including Russian) formal grammatical doctrine (mechanically transfer to scientific interpretation of Turkic language construction based on Indo-European language research), to study Turkic language construction as an independent system;
- secondly, to move from formal linguistic analysis to the stage of higher research, which has almost completed the historical tasks set by science and society in its time (development of norms of modern national literary languages for Turkic-speaking peoples, their popularization, basic dialects of certain Turkic languages, description of different stages of development), In the description and interpretation of the source of study (linguistic system and its units), in the formation of a scientific understanding of it, mainly those who argue that the transition from simple logic (formal logic requirements) to the principles of dialectical logic has come, focused on the generalization of speech semantic-functional features of morphological and lexical units; sentence construction, the discussion of the question of the interrelation of parts of speech from the point of view of substantial principles was not on the agenda, but acted on the basis of judgments and conclusions that gave a formal analysis of syntactic units (Rischel, 1992; Harris, 1993; Schneider, 2019; Udayana, 2016). The main reasons for this are:
 - first, since substantive analysis is a direct continuation of formal interpretation, the next stage of development, it works on the basis of the results of formal analysis, based on them; therefore, the first substantial morphological studies relied on the interpretation of syntactic units given by formal linguistics;
 - second, in substantial analysis, the relationship between morphology and syntax is uniquely understood; This is because substantial morphology analyzes textual (speech) events from realization to → form (from specificity to → generality), and substantial syntax from form to → realization (from generality to specificity) (Ivanov, 1969); therefore, the study of substantial syntax could be initiated only after substantial morphology had risen to a certain descriptive stage.

Substantial morphological research in the works of S.N. Ivanov, H. Nematov, V.A. Guzev and others has reached such a point of development, a group of linguists also discussed the issue of a substantial (formal-functional) approach to the description of speech construction in Turkic languages. The beginning of this can be seen in the article of a group of Turkic scholars led by Uzbek linguists, published in 1984 in the journal "Soviet Turkology" - the theses of formal-functional (substantive analysis) (Nigmatov, 1984).

The following issues are directly related to the syntax of speech in Turkic languages in "Theses":

- sentence definition;
- the essence of the predicate;
- predicative category;
- methods of section formation;
- organized predicates;
- compound sentence;
- predicate expanders;
- structural types of simple speech

opinions and views that can serve as a methodological basis for syntactic analysis are described and discussed. At the same time, the idea is put forward that the essence of speech is determined by the predicate, the predicate itself - by lexical and morphological units, the structure of the sentence - by the valence of lexical (nominative) and morphological units (possibilities of expansion). In particular, it is described as "a sentence - a nominative unit (word) formed by the category of intersection and its extensions". Continuing the views of the authors: "Interpreting the center of speech as an appearance of any type of naming/naming unit with the necessary forms based on the requirements of expression with one of the forms of the intercept category [W] [Pm] reflects the essence of the sentence at the linguistic stage and at this stage its smallest construction pattern [WPm] (Nigmatov, 1984)," they conclude. It is clear from this definition that the authors place great emphasis on the predicate category in sentence formation - in essence, this morphological category is perceived as a means of grammatically forming a sentence. Such a definition is purely grammatical (linguistic) in nature and is completely devoid of non-linguistic factors such as eclectic (unread, copied, followed) logic, philosophy, textuality - it relies on grammar and based on it, grammatical reveals the essence of unity. It should be noted that one of the main requirements of logic for a correct (reasonable) judgment/definition/conclusion - the principle of describing the higher-level units on the basis of lower-level units - is fully observed - the center is the center, the center - the lexical (nominative) and morphological level units. It can be seen that the morphological predicate category is given a leading position in sentence formation (MacWhinney et al., 1984; Newmeyer, 1991; Van der Lely, 1996).

Putting the predicate in the center of speech construction is not new in linguistics. First, the morphological form of the sentence is formed on the basis of the study of advanced languages, and this is the norm for advanced Arabic linguistics. Secondly, in Uzbek linguistics, as mentioned above, this idea was put forward by Abdurauf Fitrat, who began to bring the western form of formal research into our science. But Abdurauf Fitrat introduced this idea on a purely pragmatic-empirical basis, not "on the basis of modern grammatical concepts, as N. Mahmudov rightly points out. In the "Theses" such an interpretation was introduced in order to eliminate the contradictions in the formal analysis of the grammatical structure of Turkic languages, to reflect the substantive nature of these languages in scientific grammatical concepts (Saydazimova, 2021; Turakhanovna, 2020; Bird & Liberman, 2001).

The concept of a predicate category is also not entirely new to linguistics. But:

- first, this concept, while present in scientific grammars, was bypassed in popular language grammars (manuals and textbooks developed for the education system);
- second, when the category of predicate was also mentioned in the scientific literature, mainly the person/number forms of the predicate were understood.

Proof of this can be found in the articles of the founders of formal grammatical analysis in our science, famous Turkic scholars N.K. Dmitriev and E.V. Sevortyan on the same subject and in the same scientific collection (Dmitriev, 1956). Both scholars in these articles mainly analyze the origin of person/number forms. In Western linguistics, however, there is no such thing as a "predicate category", because in linguistics other than Russian linguistics, the predicate, which is a grammatical concept, is called a logical term - a predicate (predicate), and, of course, logical and grammatical phenomena are confused (Kar, 1990). Therefore, in Russian linguistics, the grammatical category "predicate category" is not specifically distinguished. In "Theses", this category has a completely different interpretation - almost unrelated to logical prediction - the whole of the child's reading has both a logical prediction and a grammatical predicate, and in the product of the child's reading, there is only a logical prediction, no grammatical predicate.

The categorical category is a complex category - it consists of affirmation/denial, inclination/time, person/number, integrity of meaning and forms. Each of these types of meanings is a relatively independent morphologic category, and can occur separately - beyond the category and forms of the predicate (Sayfullayev et al., 2009). But in the category of intersection as the syntactic category that forms the center of speech, these morphological categories emerge together, interconnected, in a cohesive way.

The study of the Uzbek language from this point of view M. Abuzalova, Sh. Akramov, R. Bobokalonov, B. Yorov, S. Muhammadjanova, N. Musulmonova, L. Raupova, R. Sayfullaeva, M. Saidova, H. Shokirova, M. Kurbanova (Abuzalova, 1994; Akramov, 1997; Kurbanova et al., 2021; Muhammadjonova, 2020; Raupova,1999; Sayfullayeva, 1994; Saidova, 1996; Ourbonova, 2001), et al. In these works, syncretic and discrete representation of the predicate directly related to the predicate, the peculiarities of the predicate in simple, organized and compound sentences, synthetic and analytic in the grammatically formed sentences, syncretic occurrence in the semantically-functionally formed sentences, independent and independent views of the predicate, the organization of the predicate, the lexicalsemantic and grammatical valence of the predicate and the construction of simple sentences, the verbal occurrence of the person/number and tense actants of the predicate category, categorical, adjoining and accompanying meanings in the predicate forms, predicate words have been studied and described in detail. Some of these aspects of the predicate are not specifically studied in formal linguistics, or because formal and substantive interpretations differ sharply from each other.

On the syncretic and discrete occurrence of intersection. In semanticallyfunctionally formed expressions (exclamation, modal, affirmation/denial, suggestive-sign words) the predicate -off meaning and function [Pm] are in a syncretic, inseparable state, intertwined with the part [W] that represents its noun meaning. Therefore, such expressions are not related to the diversity of meanings of inclination, tense, person, number, affirmation/denial - these meanings and the predicative function are combined with the noun-expressive meaning of each word. In addition to words, independent word groups (including forms and imitations) are represented in a discrete ([WPm.]) Form, separated from each other by the interjection indicators [Pm]) and the noun ([W]) that performs the noun/naming function. In this case, [Pm] can have synthetic (go, come, invincible...), syntheticanalytical (you went; we said, we saw...), zero morphemes (come! have!) Forms. The colorful formal appearances of [WPm.] Are functionally equal, so the zero morpheme appearance of [WPm.] And the materially expressed appearance may be in a relationship of mutual variance. For example, if the meaning of a person/number in the form of a predicate word is represented by the suffix -di in the form of a material expression, in the form of a predicate word it is represented by a zero morpheme (Rahmatullayev, 2006). My brother is a servant. / Such variability can also be seen in the speech products as my brother is a servant.

Another peculiarity of the substantive interpretation of the predicate in the Uzbek language is the difference between the forms of independent (MKSh) and non-independent (NKSh) predicates. In the following parts of the work, the independent predicate forms are given in the form of MKSh, and the independent predicate forms are given in the form of NKSh. In her dissertation, the researcher L.Raupova specifically studied the form of the independent predicate and described its peculiarities in the formation of the compound predicate. This work of the scientist consists of two chapters, the first chapter discusses [WPm \rightarrow WPm] constructed compound sentences and their structural features, the second chapter deals with the issue of independent and independent interjection forms in the Uzbek language, the following conclusions are drawn:

"The part that forms the center of speech in the Uzbek language and in most cases determines its structure is divided into two types of morphological forms:

- MKSh
- It has NKSs.

NKSs have a strictly defined syntactic function and can occur only in the context of a compound sentence. In cases other than the structure of a compound sentence, they are used in completely different meanings and functions or require the presence of additional textual and verbal conditions and means. MKSs can be used in both compound and simple sentences.

In Uzbek as NKSs -ca; -sa ham, -sa-ku, sa-yu, -sa + ya, a (r) + kan, a (r) + ekan, a (r) + di; Forms such as -gan edi, -di + yam can be evaluated. In this case, with the pure (primitive) form NKSh -sa, the remaining forms are mainly derivative [WPm \rightarrow WPm] compound sentences and derivative forms developed under the influence of the transfer of unrealistic meanings to sentences" (Raupova, 1999). Apparently, the scientist creatively developed the methodologically based theoretical concept in

"Theses" and supplemented it on the basis of evidence of the Uzbek language. The syntactic device, including the derivation of the surface structure of a simple sentence (in general, any type of syntactic device) from its central valence, is also the product of a new approach to predicate in the Uzbek substantial interpretation. This issue was studied in the works of M. Abuzalova, Sh. Akramov, H. Shokirova, M. Kurbanova. The structural product [WPm], which is the center of the potential sentence - the center of the sentence - can expand in speech based on the lexicalsemantic valence of [W] and the grammatical valence of the [Pm] part. The linguistic (linguistic, grammatical) means of forming a sentence is [Pm]. If the [W] part expanders are word expanders, its [Pm] part expanders are interpreted as speech expanders. Literally, the parts of speech are the expanders of this speech. Wordexpanders have an indirect connection to the construction of a sentence, they are the shadows, the companions of the word they are expanding - wherever the word comes in the sentence, they also follow it. Therefore, speech expanders are recognized as parts of speech, and their importance in the structure of speech is determined by the order of the predicate - possess - case/input grading. Word expanders (complement and determiner) come in the position of a part of speech, not a part of speech, in the construction of a sentence. Traditional fillers and determiners are classified as word extensions. "The use of fillers is related to the full disclosure of the meaning of the word filler governor at the speech stage, which are complete speech units. Therefore, the complements of speech in speech are the part of speech that expands the part of speech, chunonchi (that he is brave) or part of a part of speech, (e.g., madness, emotion, victory, with a deer) " (Ourbonova, 2001). In the works of researchers of new scientific directions, such as M.Abuzalova, Sh.Akramov, B.Bahriddinova, H.Shokirova, O.Shukurov, M.Kurbanova, the issues of specific features of speech expanders and word expanders in certain speech conditions are analyzed in detail.

In the substantial interpretation, the organization of the predicate is also understood differently from the formal analysis. In particular, the model of the organization of the section given in "Theses" [(W1 + W2 +...) Pm], which is specially studied in B. Yorov's dissertation, is described in detail in dozens of specific synthetic and analytical phenomena, The formal and spiritual-functional differences and possibilities between [(W1 + W2 +...) Pm] constructed cohesive simple sentences and [WPmRWPm] constructed compound sentences were commented.

Another peculiarity in the interpretation of the predicate is the separation of the predicate words. Lexical words are lexically and semantically used as a part of speech, used in places other than the part of speech, when applied, it is understood to be applied at the level of homonymy formation, in stark contrast to its use in the predicate position in terms of meaning and function. In this respect, interjection words are close to verbs, but unlike verbs, they can express different types of grammatical meanings (affirmation/denial, inclination/time, person/number) specific to the interjection category using the conjunctions emok and bolmak. Interjection words are divided into two groups. The first group is called specialized predicative words, and this group can include:

• words that are functionally specialized (necessary, necessary, necessary, possible, necessary) and genetically close to quality;

• words that are functionally specialized and genetically close to the noun (condition) (Saidova, 1996).

These words - (i) sh and -moq form a peculiar participle of one-syllable sentences when combined with the action noun forms - come in the form of an impersonal participle. In this case, the above words exclude the meaning of the person-number in the predicate: This work needs to be done. such as. Such manifestations of impersonal predicate have historically evolved from two-component sentences with a possessive- predicate structure based on redistribution, (Omonturdiev, 1988), and their relationship to it has been preserved to this day. Compare: We have to go - We should go - We must go.

Academician A.Khojiev assessed the second group of predicate words as one of the functional (non-categorical) forms - the form of specificity (Khojiev, 2010)and with the help of the suffix -niki noun (brother, Salimjon, home's...), diamond (mine, yours, ours ...) expressed the idea that the words (minganniki, alanniki...) are derivatives. The normative application for such speech products is to come as a predicate function, but they are also easily skipped: *Today we have/my brothers/brothers.... Summit.* The basis for classifying such words as predicate words is the feature listed above - normally used in the predicate function: *This free homeland belongs to all of us. The successes are ours, talk about the shortcomings that need to be addressed.*

On the basis of a substantive approach to predicate in Uzbek linguistics, we will focus on another issue. This issue has been raised in both formal linguistics and substantial linguistics (Kononov, 1960), (more precisely), but so far it has not been a source of special research in either formal analysis or substantive interpretation and has not found its own interpretation and description. This is also a matter of amorphous predicate. As an amorphous predicate, the minimal construction pattern of a simple sentence /possessive+predicate./ is structural, i.e. I am a student /. You are a worker/employee. In the structured sentences we have seen, the participle that occurs can be considered. The nature of such derivatives encountered in live speech has not yet been sufficiently studied. First, such sentences can contain only nouns and some adjectives (including suffixes -gan, digan, -yat in modern Uzbek), and secondly, there is no [Pm] paradigm in the part of such sentences - only person/number forms, nor can it have the forms of inclination/time - "I am a student" "Cen got it" type derivatives are not specific to our language or speech as a normative phenomenon. But there are such constructive sayings. In formal analysis, this phenomenon, which exists in our language, was assessed as a "beneficial effect of the construction of the Russian language" or was interpreted as the occurrence of the fall of the person/number suffixes - the ellipse (Kononov, 1960). However, such a phenomenon is recorded in the monuments of the X-XI centuries, including the work of Mahmud Kashgari. Therefore, this phenomenon can not be interpreted as a "beneficial effect".

It should be noted that we think it is more appropriate to explain such a phenomenon by means of an ellipse. Because such devices are used in live speech, usually very briefly - in colloquial sentences and with having a really expressive. Expressing the same meaning both through the possessive and through the person/number suffixes in the predicate leads to pleonasm - redundancy, so the

omission of one of them is the norm. Such sentences can be defined as analytically constructed, two-pointed sentences, and the cross-sectional structure [Wamp.], I.e., a nominative unit with an amorphous cross-sectional index. Such sentences, of course, have two verbs - possessive and participle, and they are essentially close to the sentence structure of Indo-European languages. We hope that the study of sentence construction in our language by comparing it with the features of languages with a normative construction pattern/possessive + participle/structure (i.e. Indo-European languages) will help us to understand there will be a certain momentum in the opening (Bolibekova & Elmuratova, 2021; Nurmonov, 2002; Ziyamuhamedov, 2021).

In the analysis of substantial linguistics, the definition of speech is as follows: "Speech is a unit of noun formed by interjection indicators and meanings ([Pm]) and its related part, part. The predicate is the part that combines [Pm], the center of the sentence. The possessive is the part of speech that defines the meaning of the person-number in the morphological form of the predicate" (Kononov, 1960). Such a definition is purely linguistic, in which the parts of speech are determined not on the basis of the product of speech, but on the product of speech LSQ.

In Uzbek linguistics, the substantive interpretation of the position and features of the predicate in speech is mainly these. As can be seen from the above description, it is an original (independent, unique) interpretation in linguistics, the basis of which is the scientific understanding of the internal (ontological) features of the Uzbek language and the source of scientific research (judgment, theoretical, cognitive knowledge). a dialectical methodology that is consciously, consistently applied in the process of analysis.

In the research of N.Mahmudov, A.Nurmanov the special position of the predicate in speech is recognized (Makhmudov & Nurmonov, 1995). "In the process of formal-functional analysis of syntax, the predicate is considered not as the main part of the sentence, but as its center, core, direct organizer and organizer of the sentence and such an approach is now popular in the general education system and is reflected in the "Mother Tongue Program" introduced by Resolution 390 of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan of 16 August 1999.

"Since the predicate occurs in speech as the organizing part of speech, there can be no un predicate speech in our speech. Researcher M.Abuzalova and M.Saidova have substantiated in detail that atov (nominative) sentences, which at the time were considered to consist only of possessive sentences, consist only of participles, not possessives. There is no doubt that when words come in the form of clarity, in forms other than the present and future tenses, they are only part of a participle. Navbahor opened flowers, vegetables became gardens (Muqimiy), I still remember the time of flowers. (I.Sultan) there is no doubt that the nominative pronoun was a part of speech (Makhmudov & Nurmonov, 1995). Therefore, if there is no predicate in the sentence, it is an incomplete sentence for Uzbek speech. There can be no indefinite sentence in Uzbek (except for incomplete speech).

Such an interpretation is not limited to the idea that "the absolute ruler in a sentence is a participle," but also substantiates it in every way, that is, the presence of the possessive and the possessive in the Uzbek language, but the absence of the

indefinite sentence. Therefore, the understanding of the sentence in the substantive interpretation and its types, the position of any type of expanders that come in the sentence, their relationship to each other is different from the interpretations of formal analysis, is unique. Such a difference is a contradiction, or a denial, "That interpretation is right, that is wrong!" There is no reason to claim that this is a different aspect of the same source - a description of a new aspect of the source based on an approach with different methods of analysis and methodological principles, deeper penetration into its essence, that is, the realization of the 11th principle of dialectical analysis, listed on page 39 (the infinity of deepening into the essence of the thing). In Uzbek, a participle (general parts of speech) has not only two different forms, such as formal or substantial, but also a third different interpretation, such as semantic syntax (Nurmonov, 2002). We did not dwell on this topic because the interpretation of the predicate in the semantic syntax is not directly relevant to our work.

Conclusion

The formation of Uzbek formal linguistics was based on the influence of Russian formal grammatical interpretations, so it did not specifically address the issues of methodological analysis - it simply followed Russian linguistics. Uzbek substantive interpretations emerged and developed on the basis of describing the ontological features of Turkic languages based on the methods of dialectical scientific analysis.

Formal direction is based on the principles of simple (formal) logic in determining the essence of sentence construction. Therefore, the subject of the opinion (judgment) (subject) is taken as the absolute ruler in the sentence, and the part that provides information about the final judgment is interpreted as a part subordinate to the subject. In other words, the predicate is essentially defined on an informative-logical basis rather than on a grammatical basis. Therefore, the essence of the sentence, the types of structure of the simple sentence, the nature and types of the compound sentence are also determined on the basis of having in this direction, the predicate is almost ignored. In formal analysis, the definition of a predicate is based on the characteristics of the predicate in a grammatically formed simple sentence structure, in giving a scientific understanding. The features of the occurrence of the predicate in the following forms of the sentence, in the semantically-functionally, formed and analytically constructed (two-pointed) sentences, are not included in this definition. Ultimately, there is a contradiction, a gap, between the definition of the predicate in formal linguistics and the possibility and appearance of its linguistic (verbal) occurrence; The phenomenon, which is the same in terms of linguistic means and possibilities (lexical-semantic, morphological content and syntactic function), is evaluated differently in terms of linguistic essence on the basis of the "principle of possession" (eg: When I arrive, I say the device is a simple statement and when it arrives as a piece). The source of such contradictions is proved by the fact that the basis of the definition of the predicate (methodological basis) is the difference between the bases of evaluation of speech devices. The main reason for this is that the predicate is evaluated on a logical basis and the products on a linguistic basis. In Uzbek substantial linguistics, the position of parts of speech in the structure of speech, the organization of the predicate, the principles of separation of sentence types (simple, compound) in organized sentences were described on the basis of the characteristics of the predicate.

References

- Abdurahmonov, G., Sulaymonov, A., Kholiyorov, H., Omonturdiev, J. (1979). Modern Uzbek literary language. Syntax. A guide for part-time students of philological faculties of higher educational institutions. Tashkent: Teacher, P. 24; 45-46
- Abuzalova, M. Q. (1994). The smallest construction pattern of a simple sentence in Uzbek and its occurrence in speech: Philol. fan. nomz.... diss. avtoref.
- Admoni, V. G. (1973). Syntax of the modern German language. System of the relations and system of constructions. L.
- Akramov, AK (1997). Textbook "History of Physical Culture and Sports in Uzbekistan". T. *T. OzDJTI* .
- Bickerton, D. (2007). Language evolution: A brief guide for linguists. *Lingua*, 117(3), 510-526. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2005.02.006
- Bird, S., & Liberman, M. (2001). A formal framework for linguistic annotation. *Speech communication*, 33(1-2), 23-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6393(00)00068-6
- Bolibekova, M. M., & Elmuratova, N. X. (2021). The Structural And Functional Features Of Polysemy In The Process Of Translation In The Uzbek And English Languages. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business & Government*, 27(1).
- Borris, D. ., & Zecho, C. . (2018). The linguistic politeness having seen on the current study issue. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 32-44. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v2n1.10
- Dmitriev, NK (1956). Category of affiliation. Issledovanija po sravnitel'noj grammatiNe tjurNsNih jazyNov. Chast'II. Morphology.
- Duffley, P. (2021). Logical Form–Not logical enough for logic, not linguistic enough for linguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 182, 163-175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.06.019
- Hamraeva, H. (2012). Language and style of Ozod Sharafiddinov's journalism. Tashkent: P.51.
- Harris, R. (1993). What is philosophy of linguistics?. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 3-19. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-041937-4.50006-4
- Ivanov, S. N. (1959). Ocherki po sintaksisu uzbekskogo iazyka (forma na-gan i ee proizvodnye)[Essays on the syntax of the Uzbek language (in the form of-gan and its derivatives)]. Leningrad.
- Jing, F. (2017). Investigating intentionality of linguistic landscapes from the multilingual commercial signs. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *Literature and Culture*, 3(5), 46-52. Retrieved from https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/ijllc/article/view/222
- Kar. (1990). "Predication is considered as a function of the "verbal complex" and is identified with "predication" (I.I. Meshchaninov)" Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. Ch. ed. V.N.Yartsev. Moscow: SE.- P.393.
- Kedrov, BM (1963). Unity of Dialectics, Logic and Theory of Knowledge.
- Kononov, A. N. (1960). Grammar of modern Uzbek literary language. M.: Nauka.
- Kononov, A. N. (1960). Grammar of modern Uzbek literary language. M.: Nauka.

- Kurbanova, M., Sayfullina, F., & Karimova, Z. (2021). Pragmatic Interpretation of Word-Sentences in Uzbek Language. *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology*, 623-632.
- Kurbanova, M., Sayfullina, F., & Karimova, Z. (2021). Pragmatic Interpretation of Word-Sentences in Uzbek Language. *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology*, 623-632.
- Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics* (Vol. 510). Cambridge university press.
- MacWhinney, B., Bates, E., & Kliegl, R. (1984). Cue validity and sentence interpretation in English, German, and Italian. *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior*, 23(2), 127-150. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(84)90093-8
- Mahmudov, N., & Nurmonov, A. (1995). Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language (Syntax). *Tashkent: O'qituvchi*.
- Muhammadjonova, N.I. (2020). INNOVATIVE METHODS IN TEACHING ESP. *Problems of Pedagogy*, (2), 99-100.
- Newmeyer, F. J. (1991). Functional explanation in linguistics and the origins of language. *Language* & *Communication*, 11(1-2), 3-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(91)90011-J
- Nigmatov, X. (1984). dr. The structure of propositions and current issues syntax of Turkic languages (Thesis of formal-functional research). *Soviet Turkology*, (5), 5-10.
- Nurmonov, A. (2002). History of Uzbek linguistics. Study guide. Tashkent, "Uzbekistan.
- Omonturdiev, J. (1988). Typology of parts of speech in modern Uzbek literary language. Tashkent: Teacher.-P.152
- Peniro, R. ., & Cyntas, J. . (2019). Applied linguistics theory and application. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 3(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v3n1.7
- Peshkovsky, A. M. (1956). Russian syntax in scientific coverage. Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1956.
- Qurbonova, M. (2001). Formal-functional direction and interpretation of simple sentence construction in Uzbek language. Filol. Doctor of Science. diss. author.
- Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). Modern literary Uzbek language (textbook). T.: Universitet.
- Raupova, L.(1999). The problem of independent predicate and [WPm-WPm] constructive sentences in Uzbek.
- Rischel, J. (1992). Formal linguistics and real speech. *Speech Communication*, 11(4-5), 379-392. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6393(92)90043-7
- Saidova M. (1996) Comparative and typological study of one-part sentences in Russian and Uzbek languages. Abstract of diss... cand. philol. Sciences Tashkent: Tashkent State University.
- Salton, G., Buckley, C., & Smith, M. (1990). On the application of syntactic methodologies in automatic text analysis. *Information Processing & Management*, 26(1), 73-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4573(90)90010-Y
- Saydazimova, U. T. (2021). Leading topics and ideas of new Korean poetry of the XX century. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 969-977.
- Sayfullaeva, R. (1994). Formal-functional interpretation of compound sentences in modern Uzbek. *Tashkent: Fan.*

- Sayfullayev, R., Mingliyev, B., Bakiyeva, S., Kurbanova, M., Yunusova, Z., & Abuzalova, M. (2009). Modern Uzbek language. *Tashkent: Science and Technology*.
- Schneider, B. (2019). Methodological nationalism in linguistics. *Language Sciences*, 76, 101169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2018.05.006
- Shirinova, N. D. (2017). Personal and Professional Upbringing of Learners by Specific Approach to the learning English. *Irrigation and Melioration*, 2017(2), 66-69.
- Snow. J. (2009) Uzbek language and literature.
- Suryasa, I.W., Sudipa, I.N., Puspani, I.A.M., Netra, I.M. (2019). Translation procedure of happy emotion of english into indonesian in kṛṣṇa text. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(4), 738–746
- Turakhanovna, S. U. (2020). The Issue of Literary Heroism in Korean Literature. *Solid State Technology*, 63(6), 1779-1785.
- Udayana, I. N. (2016). Effective sentences in Indonesian. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *Literature and Culture*, 2(2), 188-200. Retrieved from https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/ijllc/article/view/106
- Usmonov, S. (1972). General linguistics. Tashkent: Teacher.
- Van der Lely, H. K. (1996). Specifically language impaired and normally developing children: Verbal passive vs. adjectival passive sentence interpretation. *Lingua*, 98(4), 243-272. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(95)00044-5
- Voishvillo, EK, & Degtyarev, MG (1998). Logiko-epistemologicheskie aspekty argumentatsii [Logical and Epistemological Aspects of Argumentation]. *Moscow: Vlados Publ*.
- Volf, P. (2020). Translation techniques as a method for describing the results and classifying the types of translation solutions. *Applied Translation*, 14(2), 1–7. Retrieved from https://appliedtranslation.nyc/index.php/journal/article/view/1171
- Ziyamuhamedov, J. T. (2021). Reflection of real life through the bizarre and supernatural in the classic prose of the far east. *ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL*, 11(1), 1268-1273.
- Zvegintsev, V. A. (1985). Pragmatics, semantics and natural language. S" postavitelno ezikoznanie [Comparative Linguistics], 10(5), 39-52.