FOLLOW-UP TYPES OF SUBJECT AND PREDICATIVE CLAUSES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Urinboyeva Nilufar Ashirali qizi
Farg'ona davlat universiteti lingvistika (ingliz tili) yo'nalishi magistranti
Yusufjonova Feruzaxon Qurbonovna
Farg'ona davlat universiteti gumanitar yo'nalishlari bo'yicha chet tillari kafedrasi katta o'qituvchisi

Annotation: *There are such patterns of complex sentences as consist of a subject clause and a predicative, the only element outside these clauses being the link verb, e. g.: What I prefer now is that you should not leave at all. Predicative sub-clauses have sometimes a mixed or overlapping meaning. In some cases there is a clear suggestion of temporal relations, in others the meaning of comparison.*

Keywords: *Sentence, subject and predicative clauses, Enlish language, Uzbek, translation.*

INTRODUCTION

The part of the sentence when it functional syntactical nature doesn't change in all unlimited number of the real sentences (the subject as a source or the object of the action, the predicate as an action that the subject carries out) being differently expressed lexically under conditions of identity of lexemes is sorted as a component of each new sentence with all the new subjects, with their properties, their terms of existence, thus providing the reflection of final setting of language means of unlimited diversity of the objective world and worlds that are created by intellectual activity of human being.

MAIN PART

The system of the parts of sentence in some extent is appropriate to the system of parts of speech. What elements form the system of parts of the sentence? Their nomenclature is standard and therefore it unlikely needs the substantiation. These are the subject, the predicate, the object, the modifier and the attribute. Full parallelism between that and the other systems is not only undesirable from the point of view of substantial problems and the possibilities of the language, but also on principle it is impossible, even for the fact that in the structural-semantic nature of some parts of speech are input their syntactical half-functionality. Thus, the noun as a expresser of the meaning of the object can be the subject, the object, the modifier, nominative attribute, nominative part of the predicate.

Traditionally the parts of the sentence are divided into main and secondary parts. Taking the given designations as conditionals (such-called secondary parts,

like the main parts can belong to the structural minimum of the sentence; the object is correlative with the subject) one should acknowledge that established division traditionally reflects the necessary differential property of the parts of the sentence, and especially their participation / absence in the formation of predicative core of the sentence, in expressing the category of predicativity. Practical convenience to the advantage of such division is in its unambiguity: the subject and the predicate are the main parts of the sentences; the others are always secondary parts of the sentences.

In shaping the predicate the differences of language systems become apparent stronger and multilaterally than in shaping the subject. This is stipulated by the capacity and importance of the given part of the sentence. Actually, the predicate bears greater number of grammatical relations than the subject does.

The object itself, about which we are talking can reveal itself i.e. determine itself really only through actions and functions which are expressed by the predicate. The predicate connects the doer with the object and the modifiers of the action. That is why the predicate is factual center, which gravitates and gathers subgroups of all parts of the sentence.

This happens in any language. But it is vividly seen in English, where one cannot omit any main parts of the sentence. Here it is indicative to compare Uzbek and English composite nominal predicate.

Mening akam - muhandis. - My brother is an engineer.

It is typical for English the constructions, in which intransitive verb becomes transitive in causative meaning "kimnidir biror ishni bajarishga majburlamoq", for example: to fly a plane, to run a pencil and etc. The possibility of this kind of constructions has led to the wide use of laconic and expressive word combinations like: to laugh smb. out of the room (literally.: «ustidan kulib honadan chiqarib yuborish), to wave the question away (literally.: «savolga javob berishda o'zini olib qochmoq) and etc.

Speaking about the verbs of existence, we have already stated that they can be used not only independently but also as a link- verb, proper meaning of which is graded and has become the part of the composite predicate. The same thing can occur with some verbs of action. Such possibility is provided by the circumstance that syntactical tie of these verbs with the following members of the

sentence (particularly, their meaning of transitivity and intransitivity) remains much less determined and regulated than that Uzbek have.

As we have already said the predicate in English is factual center, which gravitates all the parts of the sentence. Particularly it is interesting to mark the fixed place of the negation before the predicate, not depending on to which part it belongs by the meaning.

We do not advocate the rights of black Africans in order to drive white Africans. Biz qora Afrikaliklarning huquqini ularni bu yerlardan quvg'in qilish maqsadida himoya qilayotganimiz yo'q.

"He wasn't born here," Leo said. "He was born in New York." "U bu yerda tug'ilmagan- dedi Leo. - U Nyu-Yorkda tug'ilgan".

Sometimes the group of the predicate can be very large because of adverbial meaning (manner) which it contains. This happens in composite predicates like:

I am horrid to say such things.

I was surprised to find Elliott very spry.

Bunday narsalani gapitishim juda ham dahshatli, Eliot o'zini tetik tutayotganligidan men hayron qoldim.

REFERENCES:

1. Apollova M.A. Specific English (grammatical problems of translation) M, 2017, p29
2. Quirk R. A Grammar of Contemporary English. London, 2012 (358p)
3. Rayevska N.M Modern English Grammar. Kiev, 2016 (304p)
4. Strang B. Modern English Structure. London, 2014 (299p)
5. Schibsbye Knud. A Modern English Grammar. Oxford,2010 (346p)
6. Toury G. In Search of a Theory of Translation. Tel Aviv,2010 (289p)