THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF PREDICATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
(In the example of the English language)

Davlatova Mukhayyo Khasanovna
Head of the of English department (PhD)
Associate Professor, Bukhara State Medical Institute
hasanovnamuxa@gmail.com

Annotation:
In this article, the theoretical basis of the study of the construction concept is given and analyzed based on certain examples. The meanings formed within the predicate form aspectual semantics and the options that form their components are determined. The constructive approach to the study of argument structures makes it possible to systematize the semantic properties of certain verbs in different constructions. In such situations, the construction is interpreted as the basic unit of the language. That is why many phraseological compounds are also recognized as constructions. However, it is very important to distinguish between a phraseological combination and a construction. If there are changes in the lexical meaning of units in certain compounds, they are considered phraseological compounds. If there are no significant changes in the semantics of the lexical units involved in these units, and if they combine to form a certain lexical-grammatical content, they are called constructions. The content of the article is to reveal the features of the study of grammatical constructions that differ from the field theory. It is determined that the meanings that occur within the predicate constitute aspectual semantics and the options that form their component.

The concept of construction has a special place in linguistics. Scholars engaged in traditional grammatical studies have emphasized that certain constructions play an important role in determining the semantics of predicative units. They found it inevitably useful to refer to predicate and complement features. In grammar, the existence of constructions has been taken as an evident fact that requires little explanation. In the early stages of transformational grammar (Chomsky 1957, 1965), constructions were in the central place, they did not come to a clear conclusion about the rules, restrictions, and norms of constructions. However, in recent years, specific theories regarding construction have emerged. Rejection of constructions applied on

the basis of general principles is often assumed to be the only way to generalize compounds. At the same time, increased interest in semantic and pragmatic features has led to a renewed focus on the distinctive features of individual sentence forms (e.g. Levin 1993).

The composition of grammatical constructions can play an important role in considering the conditions under which a given construction can be successfully used. Because it is a part of the speaker's competence or knowledge of the language; in order to understand the delimitation of grammatical constructions, it is important to determine their empirical aspects in order to determine subtle semantic and pragmatic factors. For this purpose, it is important to identify the similar features affecting certain lexical units. That is why many lexical units have similar syntactic functions. A constructive approach to the study of argument structures makes it possible to systematize the semantic properties of certain verbs in different constructions. In such situations, the construction is interpreted as the basic unit of the language. That is why many phraseological compounds are also recognized as constructions. However, it is very important to distinguish between a phraseological combination and a construction. If there are changes in the lexical meaning of units in certain compounds, they are considered phraseological compounds. If there are no significant changes in the semantics of the lexical units involved in these units, and if they combine to form a certain lexical grammatical structure, they are called a construction.

According to Diskulio and Williams, constructions correspond to litems. It should be noted that litems are the object of grammatical analysis. The compatibility or proportionality of similar contents plays an important role in litems. The lexical meaning of the units involved in this is not important. The construction is distinguished by its formation as a result of the proportionality of the lexical meanings of the units involved in litems. Diskulio and Williams define the whole lexical meaning formed by certain combinations as litemas. If we pay attention to this consideration, the lexical meaning and the semantic meaning do not differ. Lakoff 1965, 1970a,b, 1971, 1972, 1976; Lakoff & Ross 1976; Langacker 1969; Postal 1971; Dowty 1972; Keenan 1972; Mc Cawley 1973, 1976). 1987a, 1991), many of Wierzbicka's works (Wierzbicka J988) and many functionalist approaches to grammar (e.g. Bolinger 1968; DeLancey 1991; Givon 1979a, b; Haiman Valley 1985a; 1985a) suggest that implicit structure exists. The works on generalized phrase structure grammar and controlled phrase grammar (Gazdar et al. 1985; Pollard and Sag 1987, 1994) emphasize the role of organizing central structures. The propositions presented here are largely similar to the constructivist considerations in the work of Levin (1985),

Levin and Rapoport (1988), Pinker (1989), and Jackendoff (1990). From the analysis of the presented opinions and comments, we can conclude that there are similarities and differences in the theories of constructions.

Most of the linguists named above distinguish the following types of constructions:

1.   Ditransitive Subj +V +Obj+ Obj 2

Pat fixed Bill the letter.

2.   Causative action X CAUSES ACTION Y Z Sub+ V +Obj +Obj

Pat sneezed the napkin off the table.

3.   Effective X CAUSE Y ROTATION Z Subj+ V+ Obj +X comp

He kissed her unconsciously.

4.   Intransitive. Motion X MOTION Y Subj +V+ Obj

A fly flew the room.

5.   Conative X DIRECT ACTION Y Subj+ V+ Obj.

Sam kicked (Sam kicked Bill).

Analysis

There is a growing recognition of subtle semantic differences between agreeing syntactic (low categorical) frames, as well as a strong connection between the meanings of verbs and the syntactic frames in which they occur. . Many researchers argue that the scope of a verb's syntactic subcategory in any language can be uniquely predicted based on the lexical semantics of the verb (e.g., Levin, 1985; Chomsky, 1986; Carter, 1988; Levin and Rapoport, 1988 ; Rappaport and Levine, 1988; Pinker, 1989; Gropin et al., 1989).

The following factors led these theorists to postulate lexical rules designed to deal with the semantic structure of lexical units: (1) the structure of the object complement appears to be predictable by general binding rules that match the semantic structure to the syntactic form, and (2)) the same rigid verb is often seen with several additional configurations. For example, Pinker (1989) suggests that the interchange of prepositions with all ditransitives ('dative' interchange) is the result of a semantic rule rather than a product of syntactic transformation. In particular, he claims that the effective use of ditransitive syntax is the result of a lexical-semantic rule, which introduces the semantic verb "X CAUSES Y to Z" and creates the semantic structure "X CAUSES Z to HAVE Y". He argues that the syntax of the dual object in the ditransitive form can be predicted based on the almost universal binding rules of mapping verb arguments with the meaning "X CAUSE Z to HAVE Y". Thus, Pinker argues that the dative case rule causes a "conceptual gestalt shift" (see also Gropen et al. 1989). The general approach can be described as follows:

1. The configuration of the syntactic complement of the sentence is considered. It can be predicted in one sense from the semantic view of the matrix verb. Comparison of semantic images to a specific complement is carried out through universal or almost universal configuration rules.

2. Thus, different configurations of the syntactic complement are reflected in different semantic expressions of the main verb.

3. Different semantic forms of a specific verb root, i.e. different meanings of the verb, taking a verb with a certain semantics as input and giving another semantic verb as output is associated with generative lexical rules.

Differences in semantics may represent different interpretations of the described situation, not necessarily factual-functional differences; that is, the relevant semantics is based on the speaker. These principles are most elaborated in Pinker 1989, but are also shared by Levin 1985, Levin and Rapoport 1988, and Gropen et al. 1989. Unlike rule, by postulating rules that affect semantic structure or transformations that are purely or mainly syntactic, these theories contain important ideas. As mentioned above, different constructions usually and probably always come with slightly different semantic interpretations; these semantic differences are taken into account after the forms are learned (Bowerman 1982; Gropen et al. 1989). By postulating a semantic change rule, such a theory posits that changes in complement configurations are primarily semantic, in contrast to syntactic rules that have additional semantic constraints. Regularity in syntax is obtained by linking rules that give a superficial form to the semantic structure.

Representatives of the field of constructive grammar say that if structures differ from each other in form, they should be evaluated as independent structures. Because they can have different meanings from a semantic or pragmatic point of view and therefore tend to be analyzed separately (A. Goldberg, 1995).

Summary

The influence of the cognitive paradigm on causative structures is evident in the semantic and stylistic features of causative verbs. Because the meanings of causative verbs get, have, make, cause and causative constructions formed using the forms Ob+inf, Ob+gerund, Ob+PI, PII, Ob+adj, Ob+prp are determined through cognitive activity. But representatives of constructive grammar analyze several structures as the same phenomenon in form (A. Goldberg, 1995). In our opinion, devices that are in some sense identical in form can be differentiated semantically or pragmatically. From this point of view, each construction formed within a causative verb should be analyzed separately.

Her fair hair was curled carefully, and she wore a little lipstick but not enough to do any damage (Maeve Binchy, 27).

I had the boy leave.

The technician had the video working.

The emperor had the slave imprisoned.

In the first and second examples given, the first person possessive pronoun and the noun acted as causative. Causatives are units acting as an indirect complement. It is the action performed by language units in the function of a complement that is a resultative expression. In the third example, the passive complement has the role of patient. The subject acting as the causative is left unexpressed. (The emperor had his guards imprison the slave).

References

1. Bybee J. L., R. Perkins, W. Pagliuca. The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in World Languages. - Chicago: Chicago Press, 1994.

2. Transporter J., RandallJ.H., Argument structure and syntactic structure of results //Linguistic inquiry 23, 1992. –R. 173-234.

3. Comrie B., Vogel P. Approaches to the typology of word groups. -Berlin, 2000.-514 p.

4. Chomsky N. Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT, 1965. -251 p.

5. Croft W. Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory from a Typological Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. –416 p.

6. Dowty D. Causative verb formation and other verb-moving morphology // Linguistic typology and syntactic description. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. -P 301-348.

7. Dahl Ö .The tense-aspect systems of European languages in a typological perspective // Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. –P. 3 –25.

8. Dahl Ö. The tense-aspect systems of European languages in a typological perspective // Tenseand aspect in the languages of Europe. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. –P. 3–25.

9. Davlatova, M. H. (2019). Variability of A spectual Meanings in English.European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Science,7(12.2019), 778-780.

10. H., Davlatova M. "Aspectual Variability of Information Culture in the History of the English Language."International Journal on Integrated Education, vol. 3, no. 3, 2020, pp. 24-28, doi:10.31149/ijie.v3i3.81.

11. Davlatova M.H. An Integrative history of Aspectual meanings.-JournalNX-A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, Volume 6, ISSUE 4, Apr.-2020.-P.17-22

12. Davlatova M.X. The role of songs in learning English. / Молодойученый. –2015. –No10. –C.1145-1147. ISSN: 2181-2624www.sciencebox.uzSpecialissue| 2022"Raqamlashtirishdavrida mediata'lim va mediakompetensiya"Analytical JournalofEducation and Development300

13. Davlatova M. H. Relation of lexical-semantic structure of verbs in the linguistic essence.IEJRD-International Multidisciplinary Journal,6, 5.

14. Davlatova Mukhayyo H. "Lexico-semantic Structure and Its Analysis on the Example of Verbs."JournalNX, vol. 6, no. 06, 2020, pp. 189-192.

15. MX Давлатова. Этапы работы с видеотекстами на занятиях Английского языка. Международный научный журнал «Интернаука», -M. 2017,16-19

16. Davlatova Mukhayyo Hasanovna. Semantic Implementation of resultutive structures. novateur publications JournalNX-A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed JournalVolume 7, Issue 6, June. -2021.

17. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Different aspects of resultative structures according to their linguistic essence. Academicia Globe, 2(05), 475-479.

18. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Linguistic and cognitive features of performing effective actions. World Bulletin of Social Sciences, 3(10), 41-44.

19. Давлатова, М. (2020). Aspectual and lexico-semantic classification of verbs. Сўз санъати халқаро журнали, 1, 2020.

20. Давлатова, М. Х. (2018). Работа над видеотекстом на занятиях английского языка. Теория и практика современной науки, (4), 242-246.

21. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). On the interrelationship of resultive and causative meanings. World Bulletin of Public Health, 9, 212-215.

22. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Resultative and causative meanings in English and Uzbek languages. TA'LIM VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI, 297-302.

23. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Aspectual and lexical-semantic classification of verbs. Open Access Repository, 8(2), 116-121.

24. Hasanovna, M. D. (2022). Typology of expressive emotional and linguistic features. International journal of literature and languages, 2(11), 65-69.

25. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Different aspects of resultative structures according to their linguistic essence. Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research, 2 (05), 475–479. VOLUME03 ISSUE06 PAGES, 39, 47.

26. Davlatova, M. K. (2021). The process of transformation of philosophy understanding as factor of information culture of the period of the English renaissance (XVI c.). Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 1(5), 949-957.

27. Davlatova, M. X. (2018). The easy way of learning English with the help of songs. Теория и практика современной науки, (4 (34)), 578-581.

28. Давлатова, М. Х. (2021). The Expression of resultative and depictive constructions in english and uzbek languages. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 4(5).

29. Muhayyo, D. (2017). THE ROTOR CONSTRUCTION OF COTTON RAW IN APPEARING VERTICAL BOUNDARY. Интернаука, (9-2), 76-78.

30. Давлатова, М. (2020). FE'LLARNING ASPEKTIK VA LEKSIK-SEMANTIK TASNIFI. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 3(1).

31. Давлатова, М. Ҳ. (2021). РЕЗУЛЬТАТИВЛИКНИНГ АСПЕКТУАЛ ТАДҚИҚОТЛАР ДОИРАСИДА ЎРГАНИЛИШИ. Scientific progress, 2(2), 1678-1683.

32. Davlatova, M. H. (2021). Semantic implementation of resultutive structures. JournalNX-A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, 6, 291-294.

33. Hasanovna, D. M. (2023). ON THE TYPES OF RESULTS STRUCTURES EXPRESSED BY A SECONDARY PREDICAT. International Journal Of Literature And Languages, 3(03), 52-58.

34. Manzila Nuriddinovna Khabibova. (2022). JOYCE'S DEVELOPMENT AS AN AUTHOR AND HIS EXPERIMENTS WITH THE EPISTOLARY FORM. American Journal Of Philological Sciences, 2(11), 73–81. https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume02Issue11-10

35. Manzila Nuriddinovna Habibova. (2022). LETTER WRITING AS ALLEGORY FOR THE WOMAN WRITER. American Journal Of Philological Sciences, 2(11), 88–92. https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume02Issue11-12

36. Хабибова, М. Н. (2022). ЭПИСТОЛЯРНЫЙ РОМАН КАК НАУЧНАЯ ПРОБЛЕМА. Results of National Scientific Research International Journal, 1(9), 394–402. Retrieved from https://academicsresearch.com/index.php/rnsr/article/view/1379

37. Habibova, M. N. . (2023). Origins of the Epistolary Novel and the Principal Epistolary Works. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS, 2(2), 70–74. Retrieved from https://inter-publishing.com/index.php/IJLLAL/article/view/1159

38. Khabibova, M. N. . (2023). The Historical Influence of the Epistolary Novel. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS*, *2*(2), 75–79. Retrieved from https://inter-publishing.com/index.php/IJLLAL/article/view/1161

39. Habibova, M. (2023). SPECIFIC POSSIBILITIES WRITING TECHNIQUES USED IN EPISTOLARY FORM AND THEIR EFFECTS ON BOTH THE CHARACTERS AND READERS. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, *3*(5),172–177.Retrieved from https://in-academy.uz/index.php/ejar/article/view/14085

40. Habibova, M. (2023). EPISTOLARY COMPARISONS AND TRENDS. *Евразийский журнал академических исследований*, *3*(5 Part 4), 330–338. извлечено от https://in-academy.uz/index.php/ejar/article/view/16170

41. Habibova, M. . (2022). WRITING THE NOVEL OF LETTERS AND THE ANALYSIS OF LETTER FICTION AND DIARY FICTION. International Bulletin of Applied Science and Technology, 2(11), 260–264. Retrieved from https://researchcitations.com/index.php/ibast/article/view/317