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**I N T R O D U C T I O N**

Performing their semantic functions, words in an utterance form various syntagmatic connections with one another.

One should distinguish between syntagmatic groupings of notional words alone, syntagmatic groupings of notional words with functional words, and syntagmatic groupings of functional words alone.

Different combinations of notional words (notional phrases) have a clearly pronounced self-dependent nominative destination, they denote complex phenomena and their properties in their inter-connections, including dynamic inte-connections. Combinations of a notional word with a functional word are equivalent to separate words by their nominative function.

The actuality of our qualification paper is determined by the rise of interest of linguistics in the problems of the theory of translation and its interconnection with the theoretical grammar.

The purpose of the qualification paper is to reveal and establish the means of transforming predicate from English and Uzbek, with the comparison of Russian.

The tasks of the work includes:

* To reveal the properites of English predicate and the means of their expression
* To research into the interconnection of the predicate with the other parts of the sentence
* To determine and reveal the ways and problems of translating predicative constructions from English into Uzbek

Theoretical and practical significance of the work is that the material can be used in compiling theoretical lectures on the theory of translation and theoretical grammar, and the practical part can be used as a source in seminars on the above mentioned subjects.

The structure of the sentence. It consists of introduction, two chapters, conclusion and the list of used literature.

In the first chapter we deal with the theoretical base of predicate, its types and the means of forming them.

The second chapter is devoted to the ways and problems of translating the predicate constructions from English into Uzbek language.

**C H A P T E R I**

**English predicate and its translation properties into Uzbek**

**1.1 Constituent analyses of the sentence**

The parts of the sentences are the basic syntactical units. First and important in the investigation of the structure of the sentence is segmentation that is articulation of the composition of the sentence into constituents.

A sentence as a unit of the language, with the help of which speech communication is carried out, must reflect, on the one hand, all diversity of possible, constantly changing beyond the language situations and, on the other hand, regulate the imagination of them through generalizing character structural schemes and semantic configurations.[[1]](#footnote-1) Only satisfying these requirements the language can effectively function as a means of communication and a means of thinking activity of man. It is natural that a member of the sentence as a constituent part of the sentence cannot be indifferent to these requirements, but on the contrary, must provide their implementation.

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.

Part of the sentence is a two-sided language mark, which possesses the meaning and the form.

Its meaning is syntactic function, that is, that substantial relation, in which given syntactic element is in another structure of some syntactic consecution of elements. The form of the part – is not only syntactically meaningful morphological form of the word, but also characteristics, connected with the belonging of the word to the definite part of speech or to the category of words inside of the part of speech, presence or absence of secondary auxiliary words, the location in the relation to another element, intonation indications of syntactic relation- shortly everything that allows to identify the word or group of words as a bearer of definite syntactic- functional significance. Thus, syntactic form, unlike morphological one, is multi- componential.

The diversity of syntactical and semantic configurations is unlimited.

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.

If to proceed from the role that the parts of the sentence play in formation of structural-semantic minimum of the sentence, then it turns out that most of the objects and some modifiers (depending on syntagmatic class of the verb-predicate ) are the as important as the subject and the predicate. The removal of the objects and the modifiers in the examples below makes them grammatically and semantically unmarked:

She closed her eyes. (D. Lessing) She was there. (I. Murdoch)

The distribution of the parts of the sentence will be different if they are considered coming from the role in the actual articulation of the sentence.[[2]](#footnote-2) Here it appears that it is secondary parts that are communicatively essential (rhematic), as the subject and to the less extent predicate form initial part of the utterance (thematic). In the following example But she cries always in the succession of the sentence She doesn't move for hours at a time. But she cries always.' (S. Maugham) the modifier always forms more important part of the information, given by this sentence, than the subject.

Thus the elements of one and the same system are organized differently, if they are considered in the aspects of different properties peculiar to them.

It will be right in establishing the systems of the parts of sentence to come from the roles of parts of sentences in the formation of the sentence and from the character of their mutual relations. Here we can distinguish three main groups of the parts of the speech:

The first group includes the subject and the predicate. The status of the subject and the predicate is special in comparison with the other parts of the sentence. Only the subject and the predicate are mutually connected with each other and independent in the relation to any other member of the sentence as all the other parts can be raised on the base of the ties of dependence on the subject and the predicate as topping elements. This hierarchy of dependence is clearly seen when establishing the schemes of dependence. The top layer is occupied by the subject and the predicate. Look at the scheme of dependence for the sentence Small white crests were appearing on the blue sea (in it interdependent elements are connected with reciprocally directed pointer, topping and dependent elements- one- side- directed pointer from the dependent to the topping element[[3]](#footnote-3).:

The second group includes the object and the modifier. The object and the modifier are the invariably dependent parts of sentence. They can verbally-oriented, i.e. syntactically they usually depend on the verb (The object can depend on the adjective in the predicative position): I am very bad at refusing people who ask me for money. (I. Murdoch)- Mendan pul so’raganlarga men yo’q deyolmayman. the objects and the modifiers can be completive, i.e., the elements which are important for structural-semantic completeness of elementary sentence. Compare the impossibility to omit both of these parts of the sentence in the sentence: She treated Daddy like a child, [...] (A. Wilson).- U dadasiga huddi bolaga qaraganday muomala qilardi.

The third group includes the attributes. Always dependent, like the objects and the modifiers, the attributes, in contrast to those parts, syntactically connected only with the nouns. Their non- verbal orientedness determines their belonging to the different cut in the articulation of the sentence. In contrast to al these elements attributes are not included in the structural scheme of the sentence.

The problem of substantiating differentiation of the parts of speech remains complex one. It is relatively easy solved in differentiation of main and secondary parts of the sentences. Only by first one the category of predicativity is expressed, but the second one does not participate in its expression. When there is a verbal predicate, the differentiation of the subject and the predicate is carried out on the base of indication of morphological nature of words: name — the subject, verb — predicate. In case the predicate is nominative with the noun as a nominative part, it will be difficult to solve the question what is. It also can be inversed location of the subject and the predicate.

The status of the subject and the predicate in the structure of the sentence is unique. Only with the help of them the category of predicativity is expressed, which is the most important structural and semantic indication of the sentence. Strictly speaking, the predicativity is expressed by the forms of the verb-predicate. But, however, these forms themselves arise and exists on the base of unity and at the same time on mutual contraposition of the subject and the predicate, it can be said about the participation, let it be indirect, of the subject in expressing the category of predicativity.

Mutual relationship of these two members of the sentence is also unique. In combination of the subject and the predicate there are not dominant and dependent elements. The subject and the predicate are in the interdependent realtion.

At the same time all other parts of the sentence directly or indirectly are connected with the subject and the predicate by the tie of dependence.

That’s why the first and the foremost articulation of the sentences on immediate constituent parts, which takes into account the relations of syntactical dependence is the division into the groups of subject and the group of predicate (the group of nouns and the group of verbs). The subject and the predicate are the only parts of the sentence among other parts of the sentence which are permanently included into structural-semantic minimum of the sentence. In English one can come across verbal sentences of two-part type.

In imperative sentences there is not subject, but it is given in implication. This is the subject you. It is reality is proved by constructing the imperative type with explicit subject, for example: You stay at home! and also is confirmed by transformative analyses of imperative sentences with reflexive forms of the verb: Wash yourself!

The subject. The subject is syntactical counter-part and simultaneously “the partner ” of the predicate. The subject fulfills two structural functions in the sentence:

1. categorical function
2. relative function.

Categorical function of the subject includes designation of the bearer of the predicative feature, conveyed by the predicate. Compulsory two-partness of the English verbal sentence makes the subject essential constituent element of the sentence.

Relative function of the subject consists of the fact that it is initial element in consistent sintagmatic unfolding of the sentence, forming left-sided encirclement of the verb-predicate, which withstands to its right-sided encirclement, first of all to the object or to the objects. As a part of the sentence sui generis the subject is formed only when there is the predicate. In the absence of the latter the word form of nominative case of personal pronoun or common case of the noun is not enough to ascribe the status of the subject to the appropriate words.

On the other hand, quantitative meaning of the noun-subject (not its form) determines the form of the verb as a predicate or its changing part in the relation of the number. In the singular form (but the meaning of partitioned majority) of the subject the predicate takes plural form. On the contrary in the plural form (by its meaning unpartitioned majority) or the plurality connected with coordinating conjunction of the nouns and the group of subject interpreted by language perception as a single referent, the predicate takes the singular form. Comp.: The staff were very sympathetic about it. (A. J. Cronin) – Hamkasabalar bu haqida achinishdi. and The bread and cheese was presently brought in and distributed [...] (C. Brontë).- Non va pishloq sovg’a sifatida olib kelindi va tarqatildi. One more indication of primary importance of real, but not formally marked content of the subject (in the subject itself) is the choice of ways of sequence between the subject and the predicate in person in the cases when the person of the subject does not have differentiated expression: 'Then it's not your wife who left you; it's you w h o'v e left your wife.1 (S. Maugham)- U holda tashab ketgan sening hotining emas; bu faqt sen hotiningni tashlab ketgan.

The object. One of the distinguishing peculiarities of the object (in contrast to the modifier) with especially clear and consistent manifestation in English is its correlation with the subject. In general, both parts of the sentence has in morphological- lexical plan common substantive base, can be in the relations of conversion (X played Y ↔ Y was played by X). The object can be easily transformed to the subject in the passive form of the verb in the sentence. In verbal sentences the subject and the object are the closest (according to the character of syntactical connections) to the verb elements of its encirclement. The object which is in syntactical ties with the verb-predicate is invariable component of the structural scheme of the sentence. The appearance of the object in the sentence, as a rule, is determined by the semantics of the verb or the adjective in predicative use. That’s why the object is characterized by limited distribution.

The object does not possess such single structural meaning as the subject. In contrast to other parts of sentence, the classification of which is lightened by morphologization and lexicalization of appropriate syntactic meanings, the objects do not have such lexical-grammatical correspondences.

One of the common classifications of the objects in English is their division into direct, oblique, and prepositional objects.

Modifier. The modifier does not transform into the subject. Its presence in the sentence is not always determined by the semantics of the verb, and that’s why, being free in the possibilities of use, modifier can be present in any type of the sentences. Therefore the modifier can be characterized as the member of the sentence which possesses free distribution. Only in the connection with the limited number of the verbs, and especially the verbs which have adverbial direction, the modifier is the component of structural scheme of the sentence.

As to morphological- lexical base, modifiers have broader than the objects do. It includes not only nouns, but also adverbs, participles.

Attribute. In contrast to the parts of the sentences spoken above, that is the subject, the object, the modifier, which can be or full are verbal-oriented in the relation of syntactical ties, the attribute is substantially- oriented. The attribute is the dependent element of nominative word expression, denoting attributive feature of the object, called noun. It is important to reveal the distinguishing features of the attribute in comparison with the predicate, because both of them denote the feature of the object. The predicate, in contrast to the attribute denotes predicative feature. Besides the attribute is an element of the phrase. But the subject and the predicate do not form phrases. And finally, when the predicative feature can be put in the connection with the noun in the position of the subject, the attribute can join the noun in any syntactical function.

**2.1 The predicate as a main part of the sentence**

Categorical essence of the predicate is determined by its relation with the subject. The predicate expresses predicative feature, bearer of which is the object, expressed by the subject. The expression of such feature is categorical function of the predicate.

Besides the categorical, i.e. predicative function, the predicate fulfills relative connecting function, coming as mediated link between the subject and the elements of the right verbal encirclement — the object and the modifier. Thus, in the relations between the sentence in active voice and the sentence in passive voice the verb- predicate forms original axis, around which the subject and the object rotate, exchanging their places in the sentences of active and passive. Comp.:

Four doctors arc looking after them.

They are being looked after by four doctors. (Morning Star)[[4]](#footnote-4)

Relative function of the predicate as the name of the relation between the subject and the modifier is less evident, but is carried out in this case too. Because of this fact, that predicate fulfills this function, we have such sentences with the modifiers, expressed by qualitative adverbs, which transform relative existence of the feature of the action as in the sentence: The washing flapped w h i t e l у on the lines over patches of garden. (D. Lessing)- Formally whitely — the feature of the action, in real the substance. Such sentences are easily transformed in the constructions with the appropriate adjective as nominal part of the predicate (The washing was white) or the attribute (The white washing flapped).

The predicate expresses two types of structural meanings: categorical meaning, i.e. the meaning intrinsic to the predicate as a definite part of the sentence (the feature of predicative feature), and the meaning, connected with the grammatical categories of personal form of the verb (the meaning of mode and tense, voice, person and number). Joint expression of two types of meanings in one word is possible only in simple verbal predicate: Не paused. (H. G. Wells)

Though in grammatical descriptions verbal and nominal predicates are presented as isolated, not connected with each other, in general they are connected with each other. Their correlation becomes evident when contrasting the structures, in which these two types of predicates have common lexical- semantic base: verb (in verbal predicate) and nominal part (nominative predicate) are connected by word-formative relations: Andrew reddened. (A. J. Cronin) — Andrew grew red.

In two contrasting predicates – there is common conceptual content of predicted feature, one and the same structural meanings, but the latter are divided differently in each of two types of the predicates.

Thus, two main types of the predicate are the verbal and nominal. They are elementary in the sense that they cannot be transformed, both substantially and formally into simpler structures.

The third type – phraseological type joins to these two types. Phraseological predicate expresses phrasemes, containing a noun with the meaning of action and transitive verb: Не g a v e a gasp. (S. Maugham)

In connection with the last type a question arises how far its allocation is substantial. Because the construction of phraseological character can be met among nominal predicates (comp.., for example, the use of formations like to be under fire, to be at a loss, to be under age and many others as a predicate). Probably these and many formations like them should be distinguished in a separate type or introduce as a sub-type to the marked phraseological predicate? Thus should be done if the essential feature of the predicate like to give a glance were their phraseological meaning. In this case we deal with unsuccessful denomination, oriented to inessential or more precisely, not very essential feature of the phenomenon. The ground for their distinguishing, first of all, is their feature, which was called “grammatical direction” of some stable word combinations. Such word combinations as to have a bath, to take hold, to give a smile and so on, used as a predicate have not only exact semantic correlation with the verb, based on derivational peculiarities of their nominative component, but also, it is main, — simulatedness of relations of the structure and the content, determining the productivity of the construction and plurality of appropriate units and predictability of the meaning of each new units of the plurality, including new formations:: in the structure VNsg they all express single action. Remembering all above mentioned moments we shall keep the denomination “phraseological predicate” as the best.

Constructions like to give a glance find out the tendency to wider use, to the capture of correlation of wider circle of verbal lexemes. G. Kerm sees the reason in concreteness of the noun. According to their grammatical semantics the constructions like to give a glance complimentary in the relation to the system of English verb: in most cases they transform the meaning of single action, verbs do not have grammaticalized means to express such kind of action. General tendency to analytizm, typical to English language become apparent in the development and spreading of the constructions of considered type.

The status of the formations like (The moon) rose red – is problematic too. The group of verbal-copulas is not exhausted with the verb to be, but it includes a wide range of verbs of diverse lexical individuality (to become, to remain, to taste и мн. др.), then one can include rose red in the same group with became tired. Some researchers act this way classifying such kind of predicate as “verbal- nominative” one. If one comes from formal point of view, such kind of unification is rightful. Actually, in this and that case the predicate consists of a verb and a noun. However, pure formal principle of classification in analyzing the parts of the sentence is not acceptable, for in this case obvious and essential substantial differences are not considered (comp., for example: gave a blow and is a blow are the same “verbal- nominal”, though on their content they are essentially different. There are some structural differences, connected with the difference of transformational potentials.

One should, evidently, differentiate verbal copulas, i.e. differentiate such verbs, which like copulas composite belonging of appropriate field of language system (to be, to become, to grow, to seem, to taste и and so on), and others, non-copula verbs, which can be occasionally used as copulas in the speech. In other words, it is important to differentiate connectivity as an integral feature of the verb, forming its (verb)structural essence and connectivity as occasional functional feature of the verb. The following types of transformations allow to differentiate the first from the second The moon rose red → The moon was red when/while it rose, in which genuine copulas are not able to take part, comp.: Не grew old → \*He was old when he grew or The milk tastes sour → \*The milk is sour when it tastes.

One can come to the conclusion that in the structure (The moon) rose red the predicate is not of elementary type which is typical to the verb and nominal predicate. Actually, this structure is the result of syntactic process of contamination.

As a result of the other syntactical process- complication- arise complicated verbal, nominal, and phraseological predicates.

Thus, putting character of the structure of plan of the content on the base, which is correlative with the structure of the plan of expression, we receive as more general classification of the predicates- their division into simple and complex predicates. Both simple and complex predicates depending on the way of expression, can be verbal, nominal, phraseological and verbal-nominal or contaminated:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| According to the way of expressionAccording to the structureststructeПо структуре содержания | Verbal  | Nominal | Phraseological  | Verbal-nom-inal, conataminated |
| Simple  | + | + | + | + |
| Complex  | + | + | + | + |

|  |
| --- |
| Combination of these features produces: |
| Simple verbal | Jack spoke. (W. Golding) |
| Simple nominal | 'She is asleep.' (A. Bennett) |
| Simple phraseological  | Mrs. Davidson gave a gasp, [...] (S. Maugham) |
| Simple contaminated | The screams were still rising иnabated from the swimming pool. (I. Murdoch) |
| Complex verbal | H His heart stopped beating. (J.Galsworthy) |
| Complex nominal | It He turned out to be Sam. (P. Abrahams) |
| Complex phraseological | I I can give you a call as soon as I get home. |
| Complex contaminated | T Thus he would lie awake for a long time worrying about her mother. |

In the table of possible combinations, if we take in general view, as it was done above, all the cells have been filled in. One shouldn’t however forget that this is only the scheme, which is illustrated with the examples of active –verbal complication.

**3.1 Complication of predicate and types of complications**

If we take the point of view that any combination of structures “infinite form of the verb, oriented to the subject as its subject of the action + preceding infinite form of the element fulfilling the function of mediation of the tie between the subject and such form ”, forms single part of the sentence (and the consistency in the principles of description of language phenomena requires this), then complex predicate can include a number of constructions, which are not often acknowledged as such.

Depending on morphological nature of complicating element one can distinguish three types of complication:

1. Active- verbal complication

2. Passive-verbal complication

3. Adjective complication

In the first two types the complicating element is verb, accordingly in the form of active and passive voice, and in the third type it is adjective (also participle, the word of category of state) with the copula verb. Semantic parallelism finds out structural difference of complication of three types comp.:

Не may соте.— Не is expected to come. —He is likely to come.

Traditional terminology of the name of copula is assigned to the verb to be and the verbs of the type to seem, to look an so on, which come forth as mediation link between the subject and the nominal part of the predicate, which expresses the feature. But the similar function is carried out by modal verbs as a part of complex predicate, setting connection between the subject and the feature (here it possesses the nature of action) expressed by infinite form.

Taking into account the differences in semantics of complicating element, one can distinguish several types of active- verbal complication (we shall call them according to the content of complicating element):

1. Modal characteristics of connection of action with the subject

The predicates of this type include modal verbs (can, may, mast and so on) or verb with modal meaning (for example, to be, to have) as complicating element plus infinitive:

'Не can swim like a fish.' (D. Lessing)- U huddi baliqqa o’hshab suzadi

'He must come back.1 (D. C. Doyle)- U qaytib kelishi kerak

'It has to be right.' (H. E. Bates)- Bu narsa to’g’ri bo’lishi kerak.

2. Aspectual characteristics of action

Complicating element designates the stage of the development of action (the beginning, the continuation, the end), its regularity: to begin, to proceed, to quit, to keep on and so on:

She started to walk along the shingle.1 (I. Murdoch)- U dengiz yoqalab yurishni boshladi.

'His heart stopped beating.' (J. Galsworthy)- Uning yuragi urishdan to’htadi.

3. Probability of action

The number of verbs with the meaning of probability, outward appearance of action is very limited (to seem, to appear). For example:

'He seemed to have lost all power of will ' (S. Maugham) U o’zidagi kuchni butunlay yo’qotganga uhshardi.

'They didn't appear to be тоving.' (I. Murdoch)- Ular harakat qilmaydiganga uhshardilar.

4. Expectancy of action

As a result of assigning the appropriate element of complicating the action, designated by the main semantic element of the predicate to the structure of the predicate, it is imagined as accidental, but normally not expected and that’s why unexpected or on the contrary as expected, as natural feature of the object. The complicating element is the verbs like to happen and to prove. For example:

But my memory happened to have tricked me.' (C. P. Snow)- Lekin mening hotiram menga pand berdi.

'It turned out to be Sam.’ (P. Abrahams)- U Sem bo’lib chiqdi.

1. Attitude of the subject to the action

Complicating elements of the predicate denote desire/ unwillingness, intention (to want, to wish, to intend and so on)

I dоn't wish to leave my mother.' (O. Wilde) Onamni tashlab ketishni istamayman.

I should hate to hurt him,' she said.' (I. Murdoch)- Men unga yomonlik qilishdan hazar qilaman.

For the hybrid, verbal-nominal, nature of the infinitive stipulates the possibility of its use, among other nominal functions, and in the function of the object, and the verbs like to want can be directly-transitive single-objective, the necessity to substantiate the given above interpretation of the word combinations like «to want/to wish + infinitive» as a complex predicate but not as the combination of the verb-predicate with the object.

Consideration of to write (in want to write) as an object cannot be excluded as something wrong. Such kind of interpretation of the functions of the infinitive is principally possible. In scientific analyses of phenomena of the language different interpretations of one and the same phenomena are possible and even appropriate. Divergence of this kind is explained by the difference of initial theoretical reference, the fact of depicting the language in the context of different systems, possibility of different procedures of analyses and methods of depicting the phenomena. Diversity of approaches will allow to study and reflect its properties in scientific transformations fully and in details. “There is not and there will not be a single “correct” description of English language”, wrote G. Sledd. Possibility of various approaches makes unanimity of methods especially urgent within the frameworks of chosen system of description. Eclecticism of the methods and hence, the criteria gives distorted picture of the structure of the language as a result, in which existing in reality distribution of the phenomena in its systems is destroyed

Such kind of displacement of the phenomenon from the system, it belongs to by its nature, into the system, alien to it, is intrinsic to the interpretation of the word combinations like (I) want/wish to write as the combination verb-predicate with the object in those systems of describing grammatical structure of English language, in which the formations like (I) сап write and so on are considered as a predicate. Such kind of understanding is generally accepted and does not require any proof. Predicative status of can write is determined by the fact of correlation of action, expressed by the infinitive with the subject, by their subjective- process relations. This tie is set through the verb in infinite form.

The role of the verb in infinite form is not added up to the expression of grammatical meanings and relations. Can and other complicating elements are also the bearers of corporeal meaning. This kind feature is typical to the verb to want. The difference between сап in (I) can write and want in (I) want to write lies in the field of content and in the belonging of appropriate meanings to various semantic spheres. But syntactically the roles of these verbs are the same.

In the realization of the verb (I) want to write and (I) want a book there are two different meanings, connected with the differences of syntactical encirclement. Orientation to the object is intrinsic to the verb want in (I) want a book, having objective character, and verbal orientation of want in (I) want to write. This difference is clearly manifested, if to contrast the verb want (a book) to the other verb, semantically close to it.

Comp.:

'They burned to tell everybody, to describe, to — well — to boast their doll's house before the school bell rang.' (K. Mansfield).- Ular darsga qo’ng’iroq chalinishdan avval o’zlarining qo’g’irchoq uylari haqida hammaga to’g’rirog’ uni tasvirlab berishga sabrilari chidamsdi.

It is unlikely that someone will maintain the fact of presence of, in this case (burn to tell) the verb and the object. Want to tell is different from burn to tell only lexically, in particular, by the degree of intensity of expressing feature. But syntactically, i.e. according to the character of interrelations of verbs and the character of their connections with the subject , want to tell and burn to tell are identical.

6. Reality of the action

A number of complicating elements deny (to feign, to pretend, to fail) or affirm (to manage, to contrive) the reality of the action, denoted by the infinitive that follows such verb: 'Andrew affected to read the slip.' (A. J. Cronin) 'She managed to conceal her distress from Felicity.' (I. Murdoch)

7. The implementation of the action

Such verbs as to try, to attempt, to endeavour, and so on ('Не tried to formulate.' (W. Golding) 'I have sought, primarily, indeed to emphasise how much is involved in 'knowing' a language, [...]' (R. Quirk), have that general component of meaning, which can be marked as “the possibility of implementation of the action”. The reality of actions that they introduce can be positive and negative: I tried to formulate can be equally applied to both the situation I formulated and to the situation I did not formulate. Here is the difference from the complicating elements, considered in (6) where each element allows only monosemantic interpretation and accordingly the transformation of the sentence: ‘I pretended to fall over.' (W. Golding) → I did not fall over, 'She managed to conceal her distress from Felicity.' (I. Murdoch) → She concealed her distress from Felicity.

8. Positional characteristics of the action.

Original type of complication is adding the verbs, denoting state or movement of the subject in the space to the predicate group (to sit, to stand, to lie, to go). The main element has the form of participle. For example:

 'Tim stood fumbling for his keys.' (I. Murdoch) 'Adèle came running up again.' (C. Brontë) The first complicating element is weakened in its lexical meaning. Its well-known desemantization is especially vivid in the cases of displacement of the verbs in the group of predicate, which are normally incompatible. 'Oh-h! Just imagine being able to go walking and swiттing again.' (D. Cusack)

Complicated predicate of the considered type has a homonym in the structure of the language as the combination of the verb- predicate with the participle of present tense in the function of modifier of manner. The difference of the constructions is signaled by super-segment means, and especially by the type of joint between infinite form of the verb and participle, comp.: 'She stood touching her face anxiously.' (D. Lessing) and 'Ma stood, looking up and down.' (K. Mansfield)

Another distinctive moment is incapability of the complicating element (due to weakening its lexical semantics) to be modified by adverbials. At the same time the presence of modifying words is normal for meaningful independent verb. Comp.: ‘I sat looking at the carpet.’ (I. Murdoch) и She sat for some time in her bedroom, thinking hard. (I. Murdoch)

One can suppose that for the bearer of the language the second component in complex predicate is semantically central, i.e. in the sentence Не stood fumbling for his keys the main information is — He fumbled for his keys, not Не stood.

Within the limits of single predicate the combination of several complicating elements is possible. Such kind of complication can be called as consistent one:

I shall have to begin to practice’ (K. Mansfield)

In away I had been hatched there, feathered there, and wanted dearly tо

gо on growing there.' (A. E. Coppard)

I can't begin to accept that as a basis for a decision.' (C. P. Snow)

Detail study of combinatory of consistent active-verbal complication will allow to set undoubtedly existing structural regularity in this field. They are revealed particularly in a number of limitations of the combinability of complicating elements. Thus, due to the absence of infinite forms of modal verbs, they cannot be placed after any of the complicating element, they can only begin the line. In non-initial position the appropriate meanings can be transformed with the equivalents of the modal verbs: 'We тight havе to wait/ I said. (C. P. Snow) In other cases combinability is less real according to semantic motives for example: affect to chance or \*begin to happen (happen как as a complicating element with the meaning of expectancy of the action). In forecasting semantically impossible constructions it is important to have maximal caution, taking into account the intuition of the bearer of the language, because regularity of the combinability of meanings in most cases ideo-ethnical; compare such constructions, as 'At that moment I соиldn't seem to remember the story, [...]' (T. Capote) 'Poor Tom used to have to prescribe for my father.' (C. P. Snow) and so on. The number of complicating elements in consistent complication is usually limited to two. On the whole consistent complication has not been thoroughly studied yet.

Passive- verbal complication gives as a result the predicate of the structure Vpassen {toV | ingV}, where Vpass — the verb of passive –verbal complication, for example: She was supposed to write a paper on the subject. The bell was heard to r i n g/r i n g i n g. The most important foundation for the interpretation of distinguished constructions as a single member of the sentence and mainly of the complex predicate is their structural and semantic correlation with the predicate of the active-verbal complication (comp.: No component of the theory is allowed to remain — No component of the theory may remain; Mr. Quiason is expected to arrive today — Mr. Qutason must/ may arrive today and so on), whose predicative status has never been disputed by anybody. As in the case of the predicate of active-verbal complication, infinite form of the predicates of passive-verbal complication denotes the action, done by the subject. Finite form grammatically carries out the function of expression of predicativity, and semantically it introduces modifying moment in the character of the connection between the action and its bearer. Most of passive- complicating elements of the predicate (is said/ supposed/expected and so on) can be characterized as the bearers of the meaning of weak modality, if to classify modality of modal verbs (comp. may, must and so on) as strong one.

One can establish four main structural- semantic groups of passive –verbal complicators:

а) verbs denoting the processes of mental activity (to be supposed /believed/known and so on)

They are intended to be the day schools equivalent of the residential houses at boarding schools. (R. Pedley);

б) verbs, denoting communicative process (to be reported/said and so on) 'Repentence is said to be its cure, sir.' (C. Bronte);

в) verbs, denoting the processes of physical perception (to be heard/seen and so on): Distantly from the school the two fifteen bell was heard ringing. (I. Murdoch);

г) «provocative» verbs, i.e. verbs, denoting such actions, which have the action of the subject of the sentence as a consequence (to be forced / made / pressed and so on):

In order to explain these data, we have been forced to develop a number of theoretical concepts and new field procedures. (K. L. Pike)

Adjectives can also be complicating element with the combination of the verb to be or its equivalents. Such kind of complications is called adjective one.

There can be distinguished a number of varieties among the constructions of adjective- complication, which are different from each other by structural peculiarities and semantically:

1) predicate with complicating element, transforming modal evaluation of possibility or authenticity of the connection of the subject and the action. As an adjective element here is used such adjectives as sure, certain, likely and so on: 'Everything is sure to be there.' (E. M. Forster) Later they thought he was certain to die. (P. Abrahams) Т. Н.Huxley's invention, 'agnostic', is likely to be more e n d и r i n g. (J. Moore)

he sentences with the predicate with the complicating element of the given type is characterized by the possibility of application of transformation of nominalization to them N be A to V → Nv be A (He was certain to come → His coming was certain), and also transformation N be A to V → It be A that N V (He was certain to come → It was certain that he would come).

2) The predicates with the complicating elements, denoting physical, psychological or other characteristics of the subject, which is put in the relation with the action, designated by the infinitive.

 The circle of lexical units, used as a complicating element here is wider than that in the previous group. The difference in their semantics, correlating with the definite structural differences, can serve as a base for further articulation of the material:

а) Content part of the complicating element denotes capability, necessity, possibility (for the subject) to commit the action. These are the adjectives like able/unable, capable, free, welcome, bound:

Then she would be able to enjoy holiday in peace. (I. Murdoch)

'This flirtation is bound to end pretty soon.' (I. Murdoch)

It is clearly seen the correlation with the group of modal characteristics of active-verbal complication.

b) Content element of complication names the psychic characteristics, expressing attitude of the subject to the action: glad, sorry, ashamed and many others:

Dr. Kroll will be happy to show you the hospital itself later.' (D, Lessing)

She was eager to tell me. (C. P. Snow)

Моr was relieved to be with him for a moment. (I. Murdoch)

The differences of morphological nature of content element of complicator (adjective and participle) determine the participation of the sentences with appropriate predicates in the series of equivalent transformations (1) and (2):

1. N be A to V → to V make N A → It make N A to V He was happy to come. → To come made him happy. → It made him happy to come.
2. N be Vl en to V2 → to V2 Vl N → It V1 N to V2 He was amazed to see that. → To see that amazed him. → It amazed him to see that.

c) Adjectives as a part of complication in the given group denotes an objective feature, typical to the subject in the relation with the action named by the infinitive. As a complicating element come forward such adjectives as quick, slow, fit, apt, ready:

He was quick to seize on this unexpected gesture of friendliness [...] (H. E. Bates) [...]

I was slow to pick up the reference. (C. P. Snow)

You weren't fit to take it,' she said. (C. P. Snow)

The boundary between the groups b) and c) is not absolute and appropriate difference is not always manifested. For example, in the sentence But only now I was prepared to listen. (D. Lessing) prepared can be considered both as a denoting position, taken by the subject in the relation to the action expressed by the infinitive and as objective feature of relation, existing between the subject and the action.

d) Content element of complication — adjective expressing (in subjective interpretation of the author of utterance) feature typical to the subject in the relation with the action that it does: stupid, wise, mad, cruel, right, wrong, good and so on:

You are quite right never to read such nonsense.

He had been wrong to let the boy get away.

You have been cruel to me to go away.

Distinctive feature of the constructions that belong to this group is the possibility of the following transformational formations: N be A to V → to V be A p N → It be A p N to V. He was mad to come. → To come was mad of him. → It was mad of him to come.

e) The structures, combined in this subgroup, outwardly coincide with those, which were considered above. But there is difference of semantic structure, which are clearly seen in transformational level of analyses, for example:

Lost dogs are dreadful to think about. (J. Galsworthy)

She was good to look at in a broad way. (P. Abrahams)

Implicit meaning is peculiar to the components of the construction(the subject and the infinitive) : for the first one — object, for the second one :— passiveness, that determine the peculiarities of transformational constructions which differ from depicted above:

Verbal and adjective complications can be combined:

Moira seemed not to be able to move. (D. Lessing)

The first words may be more difficult to memorise than later ones.

(K. L. Pike)

**C H A P T E R II**

The ways and problems of translating predicate from English into Uzbek.

1.2 The link-verbs in English and their translation into Uzbek and Russian

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.[[5]](#footnote-5) 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.

The predicate can be expressed by two types of verbs: verbs denoting action, and the verbs denoting existence and objective reality. The use of the verbs of the first group as a predicate does not differ greatly form the appropriate Uzbek verbs of action, that’s why we shall not stop at the predicate, expressed by the verb of action. We shall consider the verbs of the second group, which includes to be and to have, in the meaning and use of which it is observed essential divergence in comparison with the appropriate Uzbek bo’moq and ega bo’lmoq.

1. Verb to be

English verb to be corresponds to Uzbek verb ‘bo’moq’. In its main meaning ‘bor bo’moq’ as it is well-known, verb ‘ bo’moq’ is used in the past and future tenses, but in present tense it is usually omitted. But in English it is obligatory to use the copula verb in the present tense too. Compare the senetences:

Men honada edim.- I was in the room.

Men honada bo’laman.- I’ll be in the room.

Men honada. – I am in the room.

Except the present tense (omitting copula verb in Uzbek and its obligatory presence in English – generally, it is formal circumstance, connected with the different structure of two languages), here the use and the meaning of ‘to be’ coincide with ‘bo’lmoq’ too. But the similarity exhausts here. Verb ‘to be’ is much richer in its potential semantic possibilities than Uzbek ‘bo’lmoq’. Thus, depending on the context, it can obtain the meaning ‘the state in the space’, for example:

The book is on the table- Kitob stolda yotibdi. -Книга лежит на столе..

The table is in the middle of the room- Stol hona o’rtasida turibdi.- Стол стоит посреди комнаты.

The picture is on the wall- Sur’at devorda osilib turibdi.- Картина висит на стене.

Let’s look at some more important of its numerous meanings:

1. “bo’lmoq, qatnashmoq”

She’ll be here all the day- U bu yerda butun kun davomida bo’ladi.

Kitty was here for the holidays.- Kiti bu yerga ta’til payti kelgan edi.

John was at the meeting, too. – Jon ham majlisda qatnashdi.

1. ‘ sodir bo’lmoq, bor bo’lmoq’

It was only last year.- But faqat o’tgan yili sodir bo’lgan edi.

1. ‘teng bo’lmoq, tashkil etmoq’

Twice two is four.- Ikki kara ikki to’rtga teng.

1. ‘turadi (narxlar haqida)’

How much is the hat? – Bu shlyapa qancha turadi?

5. 'iborat bo’lmoq'

The trouble was we did not know her address.- Muammo shundan iborat ediki biz uning manzilgohini bilmagan edik.- Беда состояла в том, что мы не знали ее адреса.

In prefect forms to be acquires the meaning ‘tashrif buyurmoq, borib turmoq’

I hear you've been to Switzerland this summer. – Mening eshitishimcha sen Shvetsariyaga borib kelibsan. -Я слышал, вы ездили в Швейцарию летом.

Has anyone been?- Kimdir kelgan edimi?- Кто-нибудь заходил?

I've been for a walk. – Men sayr qilib kelgan edim-Я прогулялся.

The verb to be in definite word combinations can acquire other meanings too:

Mr Black and Mr White were at school together when they were boys.- Janob Blek va Janob Uaytlar bolaliklarida bitta maktabda o’qishgan.- В детстве м-р Блэк и м-р Уайт учились в одной школе.

Are the boys in bed? –Bolalar uhlashayaptimi?-Мальчики спят?

In English a number of stable combinations with the verb to be were formed, which are translated into Uzbek and Russian as a rule by the combinations of the verbs of action. For example:

Не was ill at ease. – U uzini noqulay his qilardi.-Он чувствовал себя неловко.

Are you in earnest? –Siz jiddiy gapirayapsizmi?-Вы говорите серьезно?

Yossarian was as bad at shooting skeet as he was at gambling. He could never win money gambling either. Even when he cheated he couldn't win, because the people he cheated against were always better at cheating too. –Iossaryan huddi qartalarda uynaganidek likopchalarni ham yomon nishonga olardi. U hech qachon yuta olmasdi, hattoki qalloblik qilgan taqdirda ham, chunki u aldashga uringan odamlar, qalloblik bo’yicha undan ustun edilar.- Иоссарьян так же плохо стрелял по тарелкам, как и играл в карты. Ему никогда не удавалось выиграть. Он не мог выиграть, даже когда мошенничал, потому что люди, которых он пытался обмануть, превосходили его и в мошенничестве.

In these last combinations to be loses its independent meaning keeping only the function of copula verb. This happens in all composite nominal predicates, expressed by the combination of the verb ‘to be+ noun/ adjective/ postposition’ and so on.

Let’s stop in our statement at some word combinations with the verb to be, omitting word combinations of to be with nouns like he is a turner, the task is easy and so оn, which have been spoken enough about in the grammar of English language and which do not represent any difficulty for mastering, for they have little difference from the appropriate Uzbek and Russian word combinations. We shall pay attention to individual word combinations with to be, particularly characteristic to English language and that’s why they are of special interest for us. It is well-known, what meaning the postpositions possess in English. With the help of postpositions, which join a number of more often used English verbs, which enter the main vocabulary fund (to do, to go, to come, to make, to put, to give, to take and so on), the verbs with new meanings are formed. But when adding the postposition to the verbs of action the meaning of initial verb in the combination is either kept equally with the meaning of the added postposition, or the formed word combination acquires idiomatic meaning, and when adding the postposition to the verb to be the main semantic burden is carried by the postposition. For example:

Is Mr Brown in? – Janob Braun uydalarmi?-М-р Браун дома?

No, he is out.- Yo’q u chiqib ketdilar- Нет, его нет. (Он вышел.)

Mr Brown is away at present. – Hozir Janob Braun safarda.- В настоящее время м-р Браун в отъезде.

I hear Mr Brown is back. – Eshitishimcha janob Braun qaytib kelganmish- Я слышал, м-р Браун вернулся.

I am through with my work. – Men ishimni tugatdim-Я закончил работу.

Many of these postpositions are polysemantic.

The train is off. – Poezd ketdi.-Поезд ушел.

The meeting was off. Majlis o’tkazilmadi.-Собрание не состоялось.

The lights were on. –Chiroqlar yoqildi.-Свет был включен.

What is on at our cinema?- Kinoteatrda hozir nima ketyapti?- Что идет в нашем кинотеатре?

The children are not up yet. – Bolalar hali turishmadi.-Дети еще не встали.

The prices for foodstuffs were up. – Iste’mol mollari narhi ko’tarildi. -Цены на продовольственные товары повысились.

Your time is up. –Sizga ajratilgan vaqt tugadi.-Ваше время истекло.

Dictionary records a large number of stable word combinations with postpositions: to be about to do smth.- -moqchi (rejalashtirilgan ish harakat)- собираться, намереваться сделать что-л.;

to be up to smth.- boshlab qo’ymoq-замышлять, затевать что-л.;

to be up to smb. – bog’liq bo’lmoq-зависеть от кого-л.,.

to be for (some place) – yo’lga chiqmoq-отправляться, ехать куда-л and so on.

One can notice how wider English to be is used than Uzbek ‘bo’lmoq’ and Russian ‘быть’. This is very evident in a number of cases where Englishmen prefer composite nominal predicate, which consists of copula verb ‘to be’ and an adjective or participle I or II which have the meaning of appropriate verb, to simple verbal predicate. For example:

Still she was hesitant. (instead was hesitating) –U hali ham ikkilanayotgan edi. -Она все еще колебалась.

Не felt that everyone disapproved of Scarlett and was contemptuous of him. (instead contempted him) – U atrofdagilar Skarletni hush ko’rmasliklarini undan esa hazar qilishlarini his qilardi. -Он чувствовал, что все вокруг не одобряют Скарлетт и презирают его.

These visits were disappointing. – Bu tashriflar uni hafsalasini pir qildi.-Эти визиты разочаровывали (ее).

She was shocked and unbelieving. –U dovdirab qoldi va bunga ishonmasdi.-Она была поражена и не верила этому.

Are you insulting, young man? – Siz, yigitcha, meni haqorat qilmoqchimiz?- Вы что, хотите оскорбить меня, молодой человек?

As it is clearly seen from the examples, the combination of the link- verb to be with the adjective or participle I or II is equal to the appropriate verb (ikkilanmoq, hazar qilmoq and etc.), using which we translate the given word combination into Uzbek and Russian.

The usability of this form led to the origin in the speech of such stable word combinations with to be. For example:

I am serious. – Men jiddiy gapiryapman.-Я говорю серьезно.

She was giddy. – Uning boshi aylandi.У нее закружилась голова.

 Don't be so literal. – Hamma narsani aytilganday tushinmang.-He понимайте все буквально.

Не was homesick. – U uyini qumsardi.-Он тосковал по дому.

The second, i.e. nominal element of the given type of predicate can be Participle II as well, for example:

She was amazingly well read. – U haddan tashqari ko’p o’qigan edi.- Она была исключительно начитана.

Moreover, fuzzy differentiation of transitive and intransitive verbs broadened the frameworks of using participles II as a part of the second element of the composite nominal predicate, so it has become possible to use in analogous function the participle II of intransitive verbs too, which is found in Uzbek and Russian:

Now, of course, all you gentlemen are well-travelled. – Albatta, janoblar hammalaringiz ko’p syohat qilgansizlar.-Конечно, все вы, джентльмены, много путешествовали.

She is well-connected. – Uning yahshi tanishlari bor. - У нее прекрасные связи.

Не was well-mounted. – Uning yahshi oti bor edi. -У него была прекрасная лошадь.

In spite of the fact that these are passive constructions according to their form, the subject does not designate the object of the action. On should make a slip in speaking that combinations «to be + participle II» from intransitive verbs in the functions of composite nominal predicate are not frequent. Link- verb to be in the combination with the adjective or the participle as a part of composite nominal predicate force out other link- verbs, which are more appropriate by meaning in this or that context: to get, to turn, to grow and so on, which transform dynamics of the action, transmission from one state into another, for example:

She was hot with sudden rage. - Un to’satdan jahli chiqib ketdi. - Ее внезапно охватила ярость.

Rhett's eyes were sharp with interest.- Ret ko’zlarida qiziqish uchqunlari chaqnab ketdi. - В глазах Рета вспыхнул интерес.

He's lived here only since the year we were married. – U bu yerda faqat biz turmush qurganimizdan beri yashamoqda.Он живет здесь лишь с того года, когда мы поженились.

In some cases to be in theses combinations comes with the meaning of the verbs like to keep, to feel and so on:

Suddenly she was sorry for him. – U unga nisbatan achinishni his qildi.- Вдруг она почувствовалажалость к нему.

She was silent a moment.-U bir oz fursat jimlik saqladi.- Она помолчала с минуту.

For a moment she was indignant that he should say other women were prettier, more clever and kind than she. –Bir fursatga u uning boshqa ayollar unga qaraganda go’zalroq, aqilliroq va mehribonroq degan so’zlaridan uzini noqulay sezdi.-На какое-то мгновение она почувствовала негодование оттого, что он сказал, что другие женщины красивее, умнее и добрее ее.

At last we have to stop at the combinations «to be + noun- doer» (player, reader and etc.), formed from the appropriate verb. It transforms constant quality, intrinsic to this man. For example:

Не is a good swimmer. – U yahshi suzadi.-Он хорошо плавает.

What a small eater you are!- Munch ham kam eysan!- Как мало ты ешь!

Stable idiomatic expressions of this type were formed as well:

to be a poor sailor – dengizda uzini yomon his qilmoq- плохо переносить качку на море,

to be a poor correspondent – yozishni yomon ko’rmoq-не любить писать письма,

to be a stranger- biror joyga kamroq borib turmoq- редко бывать где-л.

2. The verb to have

The verb to have like to be is wider according to its meanings then Uzbek verb “ega bo’lmoq” and Russian “иметь”. Potential possibility of action is put in it like the verb to be.

Магу has a pencil in her hand. (together with : Mary is holding a pencil in her hand.) Meri qo’lida qalam ushalb turibdi.-Мэри держит в руке карандаш.

The city has 100,000 inhabitants. -Shahar aholisi 100000 kishini tashkil qiladi.- Население города составляет 100 000 человек.

In such kind of sentences when the subject– acting person is available, the construction ‘there is’ is also possible.

There is a pencil in her hand.

We haven't any coffee in the house. = There isn't any coffee in the house.

However the verb to have can be used not only with the subject, expressed by the noun, denoting person (the meaning of the verb itself – possession- presupposes it), but it can be used in relation to the objects too. In such cases its meaning is identical to the meaning of the construction of ‘there is’, and they are interchangeable. For example:

Some houses had quite wide grass round them. = There was quite wide grass round some houses.

Jack's eager conspirator voice seemed very close to his ear, and it had a kind of caress, a sort of embrace. = ...there was a kind of caress, a sort of embrace in Jack's voice.

To have, analogous with the verb to be, though more seldom, is used as a link-verb in composite predicate. This can be seen in such word combinations with nouns as как to have dinner- tushlik qilmoq- обедать, to have a talk –gaplashmoq-поговорить, to have a quarrel- urishib qolmoq- поссориться, to have a rest- dam olmoq- отдыхать, to have a walk –sayr qilmoq-прогуляться, to have a smoke – chekmoq-покурить, to have a good time- vaqtni yahshi o’tkazmoq хорошо провести время and etc. The verb to have loses its main meaning and serves as only indication for using something only once, committing any limited action.

If one looks carefully at these cases of using the verbs to be and to have and takes into account their active presence in English, then he cannot leave it unnoticed the manifestation of systematic peculiarities of English language. Actually, Englishman can say to rest, but he nevertheless prefers complicated form — to have a rest. The main point is that, in any verb, expressing concrete action and reflecting definite qualitative side of the action or state the quantitative side, the very fact of this action is included. Analytical tendency of English generate the aspiration to separate formal expression of general and concrete, qualitative and quantitative side of these actions. And then, naturally the composite predicate with the verb to have and nominal expression of quality (adjective, participle, noun) replaces the concrete verb.

A number of stable word combinations with the verb to have were formed which are translated into Uzbek and Russian with the help of action verbs in English. For example:

She has a perfect command of English. U Ingliz tilini mukammal egalagan.-Она прекрасно владеет английским языком.

I wish you to have a good time. Sizga vaqtingizni yahshi o’tkazishingizni tilayman. -Желаю вам хорошо провести время (повеселиться).

In conclusion we should state that as the verb to be with adjectives, participles, or nouns acquires the meaning of the appropriate verb, so the verb to have in the combination with the noun is often used instead of simple verbal predicate, expressed by the action verb. For example:

But if they were under the impression that they would get any information out of him he had a notion that they were mistaken.- Но если им казалось, что им удастся выудить из него какие-то сведения, то он считал, что они ошибаются.

Не had a longing to smoke. – Uni juda ham chekkisi kelyapti.-Ему страшно хотелось курить.

But this kind of word combinations is less frequent than with the verb to be.

**2.2 Transitivity of verbs in English and the problems of translating them into Uzbek and Russian language**

It is significant to note that there is an inner division both in action verbs and the verbs of existence, the division which is stipulated by, as it is called in grammar, the transitivity and intransitivity

Actually, this can be seen between the verbs to be and to have. The first one does not transfer the action to another object, but as if it encloses the action with the subject; the second one must be followed by the object. In all languages- both in analytical and synthetic languages- the meaning of transitivity and intransitivity of the verbs is established as a semantic connection and it goes back to the history of that language. But systematic peculiarities of the languages even to some extent are reflected in their formal possibilities of expressing this meaning. Thus, for example in Russian the fixing up of this or that semantic nuance, semantic direction of the verb is obtained with the help of prefixes and suffixes. Here we can note the formation of intransitive verbs from the transitive verbs with the help of ending -ся: начинать — начинаться, открывать — открываться and etc. In Uzbek language also verbs can be added the endings in order to change their voice and tense. In English (analytical) prefixes and suffixes do not carry out grammatical function on the modern stage; if they are available in the word then they are kept as historically formed parts of it. One can acknowledge the fixed prepositions of the verbs as the outer formal indication of intransitivity (to listen to, for example).

More interesting and significant differences in the matter of transitivity and intransitivity of the verbs between English and Uzbek and Russian in are in the plan of content. So, some transitive English verbs have intransitive verb correspondences in Uzbek and Russian, comp.:

to follow (smb.. smth.)- ergashmoq- следовать за (кем-л., чём-л.)

to approach (smb., smth.)- yaqinlashmoq- приближаться к (кому-л.,

чему-л.)

to watch (smb., smth.)- kuzatmoq- следить за (кем-л., чём-л.)

and vice versa :

to listen to (smb., smth.) - tinglamoq-слушать (кого-л., что-л.)

to wait for (smb., smth.) - kutmoq-ждать (кого-л., чего-л.)

It is obvious, that the possibility of two-fold “solution” of any action (either as transitive or as intransitive) is put in the fact of the connection of the verb with two poles: the bearer of the action and its object. Therefore there cannot be absolute border between transitive and intransitive verbs. Thus the verb to watch can be translated not only as ‘kuzatmoq’ следить, but also as ‘tomosha qilmoq’ наблюдать.

In comparing Uzbek, Russian and English one can note that in English the differentiation of transitive and intransitive verbs is much less tough than in Uzbek and Russian. Thus, in most cases two Uzbek and Russian verbs(transitive and intransitive) have one English correspondence:

Ochmoq (transitive) - to open She opened the door.- U eshikni ochdi

Ochilmoq (intransitive) – to open The door opens easily.- Eshik osonlik bilan ochiladi.

Boshlamoq (transitive) – to begin Will you begin reading?- Uqishni boshla.

Boshlanmoq (intransitive)- to begin Our journey began like this.- Bizning sayohatimz huddi shunday boshlangan.

Tushirib qo’ymoq (transitive) – to drop She dropped her handkerchief.- U ro’molchasini tushirib qo’ydi.

Tushib ketmoq (intransitive) – to drop Another leaf dropped on the ground.- Yana bitta barg yerga tushdi.

Yetishtirmoq (transitive)- to grow They grow rice there. –Ular u yerda sholi etishtirishadi.

Usmoq, ulg’aymoq (intransitive)- to grow Children grow fast.- Bolalar tez ulg’ayishmoqda.

In order to understand why English, usually striving for formal completeness and logical exactness of expressing, in this case it is going along contrary way , we must remember the aspiration of Englishmen to compensate syntactical constraint of their speech with more freedom in morphological and semantic relations. It is obvious, that the rubbing off the borders between transitive and intransitive verbs is one those compensating means, which expand and enrich the opportunities of the language. As a result the broadening of the meaning of many verbs occurs. Here we can also observe the influence of grammatical structure of the language on the character of its lexicon. For example:

She laughed unwillingly, and the laughing reflection under the green hat decided her instantly. U hohlamagan holda kulib yubordi, uning yashil shlyapasi ostidagi kulayotgan chehrasining oynadagi aksi uni qaror chiqarishiga majbur qildi.-Она невольно рассмеялась, и отражение в зеркале ее смеющегося лица под зеленой шляпой моментально заставило ее решиться.

You don't know what a life she led me. – Sizlar uni mening hayotimni do’zzahga aylantirganini bilmaysizlar. Вы не знаете, что за жизнь она мне устроила.

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- заставить кого-л. выйти из комнаты, засмеяв его»), to wave the question away (literally.: «savolga javob berishda o’zini olib qochmoq- отмахнуться от вопроса») and etc.

Sometimes the verb- intransitive in its main meaning- becomes transitive in derivative meaning 'biror- bir narsani(fikrni) qaysidir yo’l bilan ifodalamoq-выразить что-л. каким-л. способом', for example:

Не nodded his assent. – U boshini egib uz roziligini berdi- Кивком головы он выразил согласие.

Valentin looked his query at the proprietor. – Valentin savol nazari bilan ho’jainga qaradi.- Валентин вопросительно взглянул на хозяина.

She cried herself to sleep.- U yig’lab –yig’lab uhlab qoldi.- Она так много плакала, что наконец уснула.

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 and Russian have. The object in the above mentioned examples is the thing which cannot be in reality (literally: ‘savol qaramoq-взглянуть вопрос’, ‘rozilik egmoq -кивнуть согласие»), and this transmits the speech expressive and imagery character. Thus together with the loss of syntactical independence the verb of action undoubtedly expands the semantic opportunities and gains great specific gravity as the center of the entire semantic complex (composite predicate).

Especially flexible in the relation of the category of transitivity-intransitivity are the verbs to look, to sound, to feel and some others. Thus to look has the meaning not only 'qaramoq- смотреть', but also 'ko’rinmoq-выглядеть', and it is not only applied to the acting person and also irrelatively to any person, in impersonal sentences.

Не looks well. – Uning ko’rinishi yahshi-Он хорошо выглядит.

It looks like rain. –Yomg’r yog’sa kerak.Похоже, что будет дождь.

He sounded on edge. – Ovozidan achchiqlanish sezilardi.-Он говорил раздраженно.

It sounds like a good idea to me. Bu fikr menga yahshi tuyulyapti.-Это кажется мне хорошей мыслью.

Не feels well. U o’zini yahshi his qilmoqda.-Он чувствует себя хорошо.

His hands felt so warm and strong, so comfortable to cling to. Uning qo’llari shunchalik illiq va kuchli ediki, unlarga yopishib olish shunchali yoqimli edi.- Руки его были такими теплыми и сильными, к ним так приятно было прильнуть.

How does it feel, my dear, to have the woman you hate stand by you and cloak your sins for you?- Sen yoqtirmagan ayollni seni himoya qilishi va gunohlaringni yashirishga urinishiga , jonim sen qanday qaraysan? Ну, так как тебе нравится, моя милая, что женщина, которую ты ненавидишь, защищает тебя и прикрывает твои грехи?

The same can be applied to the verb to show, which is used not only as transitive in its main meaning 'ko’rsatmoq- показывать', but also as intransitive verb with the meaning 'ko’rinmoq-виднеться', comp.:

Show me the way. Menga yo’lni ko’rsating-Покажите мне дорогу.

Не had rank showing on his shoulders. Uning mansabini pogonlaridan ko’rish mumkin edi.-Его чин можнобыло увидеть на погонах.

Не is drunk. It shows. –U mast. Bun ko’rinib turibdi.- Он пьян. Это видно.

Some transitive verbs can be used in analogous way in the role of reflexive ones: to read, to sell and others.

The book reads well. – Bu kitobni yahshi uqishmoqda.- Эта книга хорошо читается.

Newspapers sell well in the evening.- Gazetalar kechqurunlari yahshi sotiladi.- Вечером газеты хорошо продаются.

It is not accidental that the pair of verbs in Uzbek and Russian: hidlamoq- hid taratmoq-нюхать—пахнут;, ta’m bilmoq- ta’mga ega bo’lmoq- пробовать на вкус—быть... на вкус; ushalb ko’rmoq- his qilmoq-ощущать — быть... на ощупь and etc. are transformed into English not by two appropriate verbs but by one:

Smell these flowers. Mana bu gullarni hidlab ko’r.-Понюхай эти цветы.

The coffee smells good. Qahva hushbo’y hid taratmoqda.-Кофе хорошо пахнет.

Taste the cake. – Pirogdan tatib ko’ring.-Попробуйте пирога.

How much better fresh food tastes than food that has come from tins! – Konserva bankalaridan chiqqan mahsulotlarga qaraganda yangi mahsulotlar qanchalik yahshi ta’mga ega.-Насколько же вкуснее свежие продукты, чем консервы!

These poodles must feel very cold. Bu pudellarga sovuq bo’sa kerak.-Этим пуделям, должно быть, очень холодно.

Her hands felt so soft. Uning qo’llari shunchalik yumshoq ediki.-Руки ее были такими мягкими.

**3.2 Predicate as the center of the sentence**

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.- Мы защищаем права черных африканцев не для того, чтобы изгнать белых африканцев.

"Не wasn't born here," Leo said. "He was born in New York." “U bu yerda tug’ilmagan- dedi Leo.- U Nyu-Yorkda tug’ilgan”- «Он родился не здесь, — сказал Лео. — Он родился в Нью-Йорке».

One can conclude fro here, that in Uzbek and Russian sentence the negation belongs to the word, but in English it belongs to the whole sentence. Consequently, in English the negation is syntactical, and in Uzbek and Russian- morphological.

Indicative example of the fact that in English negative sentence the negation belongs to the entire sentence, not to its separate parts is referring the negation in compound sentence to the main part, though by sense it belongs to the subordinate clause:

I don't think we've been to the theatre for two or three years.- Menimcha biz teatrda 2-3 yil davomida tushmadik.- Думаю, что мы не были в театре в течение двух-трех лет.

"Do you think he'll pay the money back?" "No, I don't

think he will. (...) –Seningcha u pulni qaytaradimi? –Yo’q menimcha u pullarni qaytarmaydi. -Нет, думаю, что не отдаст.

Adverbs of indefinite tense (often, never, ever and etc.) also precede, as a rule, the predicate. We must note that all of the quantitative adverbs, in contrast to the qualitative, which come in the end of the sentence. Only, also being quantitative adverb comes in most cases before the predicate, irrespective of what word of the sentence it (in Uzbek and Russian the place of the adverb ‘faqat- только’ is stipulated by the meaning).

I've only been along this road once. Men bu yo’lad faqat bir marotaba yurganman- Этой дорогой я ездил всего один раз.

It only blooms tonight. Bu faqat bugun kechqurun gulladi.- Он цветет только сегодня ночью.

We can suppose, that taking the preposition to the end in special questions (What are you looking at?) and in the attributive clauses without conjunction at the end of the sentence (The book you are looking for is on my desk) is explained by the gravitation of the preposition to the verb- predicate, which controls this preposition.

But not only qualitative adverbs and prepositions gravitate to the verb –predicate. All kind of determiners belonging to it are also closely connected with it. Thus, in nominal composite predicate, expressed by the combination of the verb «to be + adjective», the modifiers of measure or the quantity are wedged into two components of the predicate- between the link-verb to be and the predicative, which they determine.

The postman was an hour late. –Pochtalon bir soatga kech qoldi.Почтальон опоздал на час.

The snow was three feet deep.- Qor qalinligi uch fut edi.- Снег был глубиной в три фута.

The aspiration to introduce the determiner, which is factual modifier or the object, into the group of is clearly seen in the sentences like:

Не was mountain born. – U tog’da tug’ilgan.- Он родился в горах. (literally: «- Он был горнорожденным».)

Не was house proud. – U o’z uyi bilan g’ururlanadi. -Он гордился своим домом. (literally: «Он был домом гордый».)

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.

The elements of these composite predicates are closely connected between each other, but while translating them into Uzbek or Russian they have to be torn, breaking to pieces the predicate into predicate and the modifier of manner, or dividing the simple English sentence into the main and subordinate parts.

Bunday narsalani gapitishim juda ham dahshatli.- Ужасно, что я говорю такие вещи.

Eliot o’zini tetik tutayotganligidan men hayron qoldim.-Я был удивлен, что Эллиотт держался так бодро.

The use of such many-componential predicates with the adverbial meaning in English is stipulated by briefness of the means of expression, compactness of English sentence.

Не seemed to recognise her at once. – Bir qarashda u uni birdaniga tanib qolgan degan hayol keladi.-Казалось, он сразу же узнал ее.

I happened to meet him there.- Shunday bo’ldiki, men uni o’has yerda uchratib qoldim.-Случилось так, что я его

там встретил.

She appeared to misunderstand me.- Menimcha, u meni tushunmadi. -По-видимому, она не поняла меня.

As we can see these simple sentences are translated into Uzbek and Russian either by compound sentence or by introductory word.

The close connection of the predicate with the modifier can be seen in other kind of word combinations, which have become common for English, but still keeping its imagery character.

She was stung out of her fear.- Bu uning nafsoniyatiga shunchalik tegdiki, u hattoki qo’rqishni bas qildi.- Это так уязвило ее, что она перестала бояться.

This shocked Mr Campbell into speech. –Bu janob Kempbelni shunchalik hayratlantirib yubordiki, u hatto gapirib yubordi. -Это так потрясло м-ра Кэмпбелла, что он заговорил.

The new situation seemed likely to torture her into desperation. Ishning bunday tus olishi uni qayg’uga botiradi degan hayolga olib keldi.-Изменившееся положение дел, казалось, доведет ее до отчаяния.

In such word combinations the meaning of the modifier of manner is always present.

to frown — humrayib qaramoq- взглянуть исподлобья, глядеть хмурясь

to scowl — jahl bilab qaramoq-сердито смотреть

to stare — baqrayib qaramo-смотреть пристально, с изумлением уставиться

to smile — iljayib qaramoq-с улыбкой взглянуть на кого-л.

to smirk — o’ziga ishongan holda iljayib qaramoq-смотреть с самодовольной, деланной или глупой улыбкой

to grin —tishini ko’rsatib qaramoq- смотреть с ухмылкой

to squint —bilintirmay qaramoq- смотреть искоса, украдкой

to snub — past nazar bilan qaramoq-смотреть свысока, с презрением an so on.

As it is clearly seen such verbs are translated into Uzbek and Russian not by a single word, but by the combinations of the words.

**C O N C L U S I O N**

Our qualification paper deals with the problems of the theory of translation and the theoretical grammar, and it was carried out at the interfaces between these two subjects, which shows their close connection.

The object of investigation was English predicate, its properties and the way of transforming it into Uzbek language, but we have also touched Russian.

In general while translating the predicate there are not any difficulties, if the predicate is expressed by the action verbs, therefore we have taken the most interesting and significant, and at the same time causing problems for the translator parts of the predicate, that is the link- verbs, to be and to have. Besides being a link verb they fulfill a greater number of functions, sometimes forming idiomatic expressions. Generally to be is not translated into Uzbek in present tense, but in the future and in the past tenses it appears. We have revealed the cases when one should use action verbs in translation. The same is with the verb to have, which besides its main meaning “ega bo’lmoq” have a number of different meanings, and most of them are idiomatic.

In the first chapter we have looked through the theoretical base of the predicate, the structure of the sentence, the interrelations of the predicate with other parts of the sentence and one problem that is typical to the predicate, its complication features. We have also discussed the types of complications.

As the main part of the sentence the predicate is in the center of attention, and there are many tasks and problems concerning it, and the research into it will be continued. And in our qualification paper we just tried to combine these all and approach to it from not only theoretical, but also from practical point of view.
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