

THE PROBLEM OF SUBJECT AND PREDICATE ACCORDING TO THE
CONCEPTION OF PROFESSOR MUKHIN A.M

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7523899>

Shakarova Zarnigor Yusupovna



ELSEVIER



Received: 09-01-2023

Accepted: 10-01-2023

Published: 22-01-2023

Abstract: This article deals with the issue of syntactic relations in linguistics, based on the works of prof. Mukhin in which sentences are syntactically used in modern linguistics layer analysis, component and syntax analysis.

Keywords: Subject, Predicate, Syntactic level, Deep structure, Surface Structure, Complete sentences.

About: FARS Publishers has been established with the aim of spreading quality scientific information to the research community throughout the universe. Open Access process eliminates the barriers associated with the older publication models, thus matching up with the rapidity of the twenty-first century.



As it is known, complete sentences must contain a subject and its predicate, but we will have question that what do those terms mean? Let's take a look at some definitions. According to some scholars subject of a sentence is the person, animal, place, or thing the sentence revolves around. The subject typically does or is something in a sentence and often performs the verb. For example, "Lilly is beautiful." And we can say that ins this sentence subject is given in the forms of name of person who is called Lilly. In some cases subject of a sentence can be in the form of pronoun, name, plase or etc. It is time to define the definition of predicate.A predicate is the part of a sentence that compliments the subject, for instance, it tells us what the subject is/does. Predicates must contain a verb and can also contain objects and additional words and phrases. As we mentioned, predicates often contain objects. An object of a sentence is the person, animal, place, or thing on the receiving end of a verb. Let's break down the following sentence as an example: "Rony kicked the ball" In this example the subject is "Rony", the verb is "kicked", the object is "the ball" the predicate is "kicked the ball". According to this condition we should remember that not all sentences need an object, but they do need a predicate. And in this kind of problem a number of linguists worked and tried to explain the relationship between subject and predicate. One of them is prof. Mukhin. To begin with, at the lexical level of his analysis, Mukhin wants to describe lexemes (verbs, adjectives, or nouns) and their valence or governance. At the syntactic level, it postulates syntaxemes and sentence components. He proposed them as substantive agent syntax and the Earth moves around the sun. Instead of using the terms "subject", "verb" and "object", Mukhin uses the terms

"nuclear predicative component" (that is, the component on which something is predicated), "nuclear predicative component" and "nuclear dependent uses 'non-component'". Components are connected by syntactic relations of predication and subordination. Since a verb lexeme can have two nouns as valence at the lexical level, but only one noun at the syntactic level, Mukhin concludes that it is necessary to investigate the interaction of the lexical and syntactic levels. The terms "deep structure" and "surface structure" are used, but the concepts so defined are not the same as the concepts under these labels in transformational generative grammar. In Mukhin's model, each level has a deep and surface structure. Phonologically, deep structure includes syllables, which are called "structural units", and surface structure includes sequences of phonemes. there are more derivational morphemes, and the surface structure has thematically connected morphemes, that is, there is a base and one or more grammatical morphemes, depending on the type of language. At the lexical level, the deep structure consists of shared lexeme patterns called "phrases", and the surface structure consists of lexemes. Phrases are abstract and do not have an associated intonation pattern, while syntagms or sequences of sentences have an associated intonation pattern. Mukhin unfortunately does not provide sample analyzes of a series of sentences to show what each level of deep and surface structure would look like, making it difficult to see where the loose ends are in his model. But his book is also useful in another way, because it shows the origins of Mukhin's ideas in the work of earlier Soviet linguists. Indeed, the quotations are so numerous, some so long, that the book could serve as a history of Soviet syntax. Although Mukhin covers a topic well known to generative linguists, if not to all linguists outside the Soviet Union, it must be said that his discussion is very valid. However, his references to American linguistic theory are casual and misleading. Again the simplistic view of "descriptivists" dealing only with mechanical procedures is repeated. Chomsky's *Current Affairs* is not the most recent of his publications, and Chomsky has been criticized for not taking into account syntactic relations such as subordination. This remark represents an ignorance of the development of bar-X, which was in its first public form in 1970, as well as a misunderstanding of Harris's work. It's easy to score points and patronize a book like Mukhin's review, but it's more useful to see it as a step forward in Soviet linguistics. In the late 1960s, Soviet linguistics seemed to flourish with the harvest of transformative research. What happened was that the transformational work got bogged down in inadequate syntactic concepts (e.g. Saumjan's).

By introducing the concept of input communication, A.M. Mukhin brings his position closer to the point of view of syntacticians who tried to prove the introduction of the input component at the same time to the grammatical structure of the sentence. In the author's interpretation, this is a one-sided relationship,

similar to the subordinate but different from it. orientation from the dependent component (in this case, input) not to one dominant word, but to the entire sentence. Finally, an appositive conjunction is a conjunction between an adjunct and the noun being identified. Usually, in this case, either a type of subordinating relationship (incomplete agreement or nominative suffix) or a coordinating conjunction. Both solutions are vulnerable because 1) the vector of dependence in appositive compounds is difficult to determine, or usually undetectable, and the possibility of replacing the apposition and the antecedent is almost always present, invalidating the assumption of subordination; and 2) compositional relations can always be renewed by compositional connection, that is, the introduction of a coordinating union; operations such as positive combinations are not allowed. Therefore, A.M. Mukhin's position deserves support. In this case, it is important to show a special type of communication and emphasize its distinguishing feature: the application is not only connected with the previous sentence, but also indirectly, through it, it is connected with the connected component of the previous sentence, appearing in metathesis application and previous. Another thing is that questions such as this name the conjunction and determine its place in the system of syntactic relations. A.M. Mukhin's concept is, in a certain sense, against the above concepts of O. Jespersen, L. Elmslev, L. Tenier, and even A.I. Smirnitsky. If the second one can be called "minimalist," he tries to find the most basic things in the proposal, types of syntactic connections, abstracting from details, while the first one, on the contrary, tries to take everything into account. However, the system of syntactic relations built by A.M. Mukhin, in fact, repeats the structure of the sentence-of course, how the author sees it. The researcher does not consider it necessary to distinguish between the components that traditional grammar calls "secondary elements" of the proposition. All the elements, called definitions, adverbs, and cases, are essentially one and the same component of the proposition, that is, dependent. They can be represented by different parts of speech. It was this decision that allowed the author to distinguish one type of connection subordinate; otherwise, the system would probably have 8 rather than 6 conjunction types, containing a determiner (or attributive), an adverb (or subject) instead of a subordinate clause, and subordinate clause. It should also be noted that the basis for all of A.M. Mukhin's conclusions is served by experiences consisting of one or the omission of another component of the sentence. In the case of the replacement or replacement of components, the component is considered a synonym. The author does not take into account the official signs of postulated connections. At the same time, it is clear that the proposition is missing some component, and to make sure that the proposition without it is incomplete, incapable, etc., we get information about this component: it is required by the structure of the sentence, its constituent is introduced as a part,

that is, we get information about the syntactic relationship in which this component is included: After all, the structure is a sum of components and the relationship between them. But at the same time, we do not get any information about how this relationship is embodied in the verbal structure of the sentence. Mukhin's system of syntactic relations is actually a system of syntactic relations; precisely because of this, it actually repeats the structure of propositions in the author's understanding. It follows that syntactic connection is understood as a way or means of expression of structural-semantic relations between components of phrases or sentences. This concept is further deepened: "Syntactic connection is a two-dimensional entity, characterized by a certain form and a certain generalized meaning," and the form of communication is the actual means of expression, and the content is "relationships, things in the objective world that can be established between events" A.M. Mukhin wrote that: "while investigating the most elementary syntactic units the main attention, furthermore, was given to the sentence structure notion - to the constructive unit of syntactic level of language" But "each grammatical form has its own content and this content is closely connected with the form". In other words, the aspects of semantic (content), grammatical (formal) and intonative never exist separately and can't be in isolated forms from one another. On this account some scholars treat and defend this conception that "syntax and semantics are important parts of grammar".

In conclusion, it should also be noted that the basis for all of A.M. Mukhin's conclusions is served by experiences consisting of one or the omission of another component of the sentence. In the case of the replacement or replacement of components, the component is considered a synonym. The author does not take into account the official signs of postulated connections. At the same time, it is clear that the proposition is missing some component, and to make sure that the proposition without it is incomplete, incapable, etc., we get information about this component: it is required by the structure of the sentence, its constituent is introduced as a part, that is, we get information about the syntactic relationship in which this component is included. After all, the structure is a sum of components and the relationship between them. But at the same time, we do not get any information about how this relationship is embodied in the verbal structure of the sentence.

REFERENCES:

1. Usmanov U.U., Nosirova R.A., Kabeyanova D.T. <<Actual problems of English Theoretical Grammar>> 2015.
2. Maksumov A, Abdulla. M. <<English grammar: theory and usage>> 2016

3.A.M.Mukhin <<Linguistic analysis: Theoretical and methodological problems>> : Nauka, 1976.

4.Mukhin A.M <<Syntax analysis and problem level writing >> - L. : Nauka, 1980.