

## **SPRACHLICHE MERKMALE DER VORHERSAGE IN RUSSISCHEN UND USBEKISCHEN SPRACHEN**

**Yuldashev Aziz Uzgenovich**

Dozent, Fakultät für usbekische und russische Sprachen, Tashkent University  
of Information Technologies, benannt nach Muhammad al-Khwarizmi.

**E-Mail: yuldashevaziz1003@gmail.com**

**Zusammenfassung:** Der Zweck dieses Artikels besteht darin, eine vergleichende Analyse der Prädikation in Russisch und Usbekisch durchzuführen. Dabei werden die linguokulturellen Besonderheiten dieses sprachlichen Prozesses berücksichtigt. Der Text des Artikels definiert den Begriff der Prädikation, der selbst in der Philologie und Sprachforschung nur selten verwendet wird. Darüber hinaus wird auf die Einzigartigkeit dieses Artikels Wert gelegt - zwei Sprachen unterschiedlicher Sprachen von Gruppen werden verglichen. Darüber hinaus unterscheiden sich die nationalen Kulturen der Sprecher dieser Sprachen erheblich. Der Text des Artikels ist mit Beispielen für Prädikationen in russischer Sprache gefüllt; der Schwerpunkt liegt auf unpersönlichen und verbalen Sätzen, von denen viele durch die kulturellen Besonderheiten der Muttersprachler erklärt werden. Weiter im Artikel wird eine Analyse usbekischer Vorhersagebeispiele vorgestellt. Gleichzeitig werden usbekische Prädikationsbeispiele mit russischen verglichen. Am Ende des Artikels wird eine verallgemeinernde Schlussfolgerung gezogen, dass die ausgewählten Sprachen einander ähnlich sind und diese Ähnlichkeit auf eine langfristige interkulturelle Interaktion zurückzuführen ist. Auch der Bedarf an neuer philologischer und linguistischer Forschung zu diesem Thema wird betont.

**Schlüsselwörter:** Vorhersage, russische Sprache, usbekische Sprache, Kulturlinguistik, vergleichende Analyse.

## **LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL FEATURES OF PREDICATION IN RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES**

Yuldashev Aziz Uzgenovich - Lecturer, Department of Uzbek and Russian  
Languages, Tashkent University of Information Technologies named after  
Muhammad al-Khwarizmi.

**Abstract:** the purpose of this article is to conduct a comparative analysis of predication in Russian and Uzbek. The linguoculturological features of this linguistic process are taken into account. The text of the article defines the concept of predication, which itself is rarely used in philology and linguistic research. In addition, an emphasis is placed on the uniqueness of this article - two languages of different language groups are compared. In addition, the national cultures of the speakers of these languages differ significantly. The text of the article is filled with examples of predication in Russian; the emphasis is on impersonal and verbal sentences, a large number of which are explained by the cultural characteristics of native speakers. Further in the article, an analysis of Uzbek examples of predication is presented. At the same time, Uzbek examples of predication are compared with Russian ones. At the end of the article, a generalizing conclusion is made that the selected languages are similar to each other, and this similarity is due to long-term intercultural interaction. There is also an emphasis on the need for new research in the field of philology and linguistics on this issue.

**Keywords:** predication, Russian language, Uzbek language, cultural linguistics, comparative analysis.

**Introduction.** This article is devoted to the main concept used in philology - predication. At the same time, predication is considered in the context of comparing two languages - Russian and Uzbek. The subject of this research is the linguocultural features of predication. This means that attention will be paid to cultural influences on the construction of predication in the selected languages. It should be noted that the selected languages belong to different language groups: Russian belongs to the East Slavic group, Uzbek is the language of the Turkic group. Such differences in the selected languages give this article uniqueness and scientific novelty.

First, it is necessary to define the conceptual apparatus of this article. Predication is a fairly common concept that is found in philological research. It is one of the central concepts of this study. Nevertheless, for philology, it is somewhat specific. The fact is that initially the concept was developed in logic and is not used in all philological and linguistic studies. In logic, a predicate is understood as a statement that speaks about the subject. In turn, the subject is what the statement is about. Undoubtedly, this concept is one of the main in linguistics. However, due to the unpopularity of its use, it can rarely be found in philology. A scientific concept may contain a different meaning, which depends on the preferences of a particular

linguistic school or direction. However, when referring to dictionaries of philological and linguistic terms, this concept is explained in a satisfactory volume. Predication refers to the process of formulating a sentence, in which the ratio of three components is taken into account: a certain content, the subject of thought and the surrounding reality[1]. As can be seen from this definition, preference is given to the ratio of the thought process to reality.

A different interpretation of the term predication is more applied. As you know, one of the most important functions and goals of any language is the statement of facts about surrounding objects, personalities, ongoing events. To achieve this goal, native speakers must answer the following questions: "Who / what are we talking about?"; "What does a person say about any event or person (s)?" ; "What does the person say about an event or person"? The first question is answered by reference or identification. The answer to the rest of the questions is given by predication [2]. In this case, it can be noted that the concepts of reference and predication are separate. When comparing this definition with the previous one, it can also be noted that it more clearly and specifically characterizes the term. The first definition, in comparison with the second, looks more vague. By and large, based on the first definition, the concept of predication is identical to the concept of reference. Later editions interpret the term "predication" as a synthesis of objects in human thinking, which are expressed verbally or in writing (in the form of separate words). This synthesis is performed in order to characterize a particular subject, as well as reflect the events and situations that are taking place [3]. All of the above concepts are applicable to the analysis of predication, therefore, within the framework of this article, they will be used in a complex manner.

An important aspect of this article is the linguistic and cultural features. The connection between language and national consciousness and culture has long become an indisputable fact. Such prominent scientists as W. Whorf, E. Sapir, W. Humboldt wrote about this. Languages are undoubtedly connected with the process of thinking: "As a matter of fact, all attempts to characterize languages typologically (for example, languages with an analytical or synthetic tendency, languages of an ergative or active system) imply an exit to the specifics of thinking" [4]. It should be noted that scientists are interested not only in the connection between language and thinking, but also in the national-specific features of the language, the ethnocultural feature of many linguistic phenomena. Such an approach to the study of languages allows us to understand the process of conceptualization in a particular language, explains the peculiarities of the picture of the world.

The study of national and cultural characteristics is of interest not only in such sections as vocabulary or phraseology, but also in the grammatical categories of the

language. Researchers of grammatical processes are trying to find national and cultural characteristics and established types of behavior among the people who speak a particular language. Similar questions of linguistics are constantly discussed in scientific circles. So, in scientific articles one can often find opinions that, for example, the appeal to reality is more pronounced in German than in French. Or English grammar is more sensitive to human behavior and changes in it. As for Russian grammar, one can trace the traditional fatalism characteristic of Russians.

Of course, the above points of view are not the ultimate truth and to some extent are stereotyped from the point of view of the national-cultural conditionality of the language. Within the framework of this article, the linguoculturological features of predication in the Russian and Uzbek languages are considered. Examples of predication of the Russian language are considered separately, then a comparative analysis with the Uzbek language is performed, the purpose of which is to identify the similarities and differences in the named languages. Although the Russian and Uzbek languages belong to different linguistic groups, have significant grammatical differences, developed in different national and cultural environments, these languages, nevertheless, can become objects of linguocultural analysis. This is due, first of all, to the fact that the peoples of Russia and Uzbekistan have been and are still conducting intercultural interaction. For example, in the days of the USSR, one people nominally lived in Russia and Uzbekistan. During this time period, the Russian and Uzbek languages have undergone cultural influences. Mutual influence did not stop after the collapse of the Soviet Union. A large Russian diaspora still lives in Uzbekistan, citizens of Uzbekistan often migrate to Russia. Thus, the cultures of both peoples continue to influence each other, which is expressed in the language.

**Methodology.** A few words about the method used in this study. The article uses the method of comparative analysis. This method is used both in linguistic and cultural studies and in linguistic research in general. This method describes facts within one or more languages. Attention is drawn to the individual and general properties of languages that have become objects of analysis. This method is used to search for common patterns, analogies in the selected languages. Since within the framework of this article the emphasis is placed on linguocultural features, there is a constant appeal to the ethnocultural traditions of the speakers of the selected languages. Using the method used, it is possible to formulate hypotheses that will give rise to new research on this topic.

**Results.** Some scholars in the field of linguistics and philology of the Russian language believe that the Russian language is replete with impersonal constructions. If we consider such constructions from a linguoculturological point of view, we can see that they express the properties inherent in the Russian

character. This includes unjustified fatalism, love for irrational actions, some passivity in relation to what is happening, the inability to change anything.

This feature of the Russian language E.S. Yakovleva explains that “impersonality serves as a kind of grammatical metaphor for the Russian mentality” [5]. A.Vezhbitskaya believes that the Russian mentality is passive, uncontrollable and irrational. Thus, impersonality among Russians is an important property of linguistic consciousness. This is evidenced by the abundance of impersonal and infinitive constructions in the syntax of the Russian language. These constructions indicate that the world is a set of events that a person cannot not only influence, but even understand what is happening [6].

**Analysis.** Summarizing the observations of researchers of the Russian language, we can conclude that the lack of explicitness of the subject in the sentence, the impersonality of the construction are characteristic ethnocultural features of predication in the Russian language. This conclusion caused a certain resonance among language researchers and gave rise to many discussions. Ethno-cultural understanding of syntax and grammar in general has become the object of observation and analysis of many researchers.

An interesting feature characteristic of the predication of the Russian language is the non-verbalization of verbs in the sentence structure. Unlike many European languages, this feature retains the meaning of the sentence. This phenomenon reflects the more implicit nature of the Russian language system compared to other languages. The verbosity in the sentences of the Russian language may well be interpreted by cultural and ethnic characteristics. A verbal construction as a certain type of sentence is an indicative property of the Russian language system: “It is hardly possible to find a language that would have one unique way of constructing a sentence; but it is difficult to say for sure which model should be taken as a sample sentence in a given language, and which should not ... In some languages, the type of a non-verbal sentence expresses the essence of the grammatical system. In general, they cannot be replaced by another type of sentence, as a result of which they will never completely disappear. This situation is observed, for example, in the Russian language, where verbal sentences are the normal type for expressing some types of evaluative and possessive predication. In other languages, for example in Czech, not being in such a close connection with the very essence of the grammatical system, they are an occasional type. Here they can always be replaced by verb sentences, and in some styles they do not occur at all” [7].

When comparing the Russian language with other languages, the abundance of verbal forms emphasizes its uniqueness. In other languages, an auxiliary verb is required. For example, in the syntax of English and German, there is a linking verb:



“She is beautiful”; “Er ist Gauner”, while in Russian it is enough to say: “она красивая”; “Он обманщик”. In addition, in the languages listed, there are also non-verbal constructions, but they often have their own grammatical nature and often they are taken out of the main sentence [8].

English and German have little affinity with Russian. However, the verbal constructions of the Russian language do not lose their uniqueness when compared with the languages of the Slavic group. In the systems of languages of the Slavic group, verbal constructions are to a greater extent allowed. However, they still have an auxiliary linkage, for example, a demonstrative pronoun. Thus, in related Polish language, a demonstrative pronoun is used in non-verbal constructions, which is called a nominal or compound predicate.

How can such a loss of a linking verb or other auxiliary pronoun be explained in the verb constructions of the Russian language? A number of experts believe that this feature of the Russian language has a linguoculturological explanation. Predicative forms without a verb have their roots in antiquity. This hypothesis is confirmed by Old Russian nominal sentences. For example, “Трех сладко, а человек падко”. In a specific example, predication reflects the essential relationship of concepts [9]. The same researcher testifies that in such sentences the linking verb was introduced later, then again it was excluded or replaced by punctuation marks. This type is preserved in the modern languages of the Slavic group, but, as noted earlier, without the presence of any connecting words, it remained only in the Russian language.

There is also another hypothesis that there are no auxiliary verbs in Russian predication. Historically, the Russian language lacks the present tense form of the verb “быть”. Accordingly, the exclusion of this verb from many sentences is explained by the evolution of the Russian language. Some modern types of nominal sentences indicate that the language has undergone simplification in the course of cultural and historical changes [10].

An interesting phenomenon is encountered in the Russian language, which is an example of predication, the features of which can be explained from a linguoculturological point of view. So in the Russian language there is the word “бахвалиться”, this word is rarely used in modern everyday speech. Etymologically, this word is formed from two verbs “баять” (to tell something) and «хвалить». Thus, two linguocultural images of a person are obtained: “человек, который говорит о себе” and “человек, который хвастается, хвалится”. Taken together, this verb denotes a person who praises only himself. In Russian linguoculture, boasting means showing selfishness and pride[11]. A single word, thus, can characterize several personal qualities of the subject.

Such polysemous verbs are often found in Russian. So, the verb «лукавить», that is, to tell a lie with malicious intent, to hypocrite, to pretend. In the above verb, the linguoculturological connection is even stronger, since it speaks of “лукавом”, that is, of evil spirits, the devil. A sentence with this verb can characterize the subject ambiguously: the subject has a connection with an evil spirit; the moral and ethical behavior of the subject is assessed.

Not only individual verbs, but also adjectives have an analogous linguoculturological property of predication. In Russian there is an adjective “велеречивый”. Usually, this adjective characterizes a subject who is trying to make his own speech unnecessarily decorated. Sometimes such stiffness is inappropriate in a particular life situation. This adjective has a negative connotation, while this adjective does not have a positive connotation. In turn, in the Russian language there is an adjective “красноречивый”, which has the same meaning, but contains an exclusively positive connotation. Thus, both adjectives equally characterize a person's speech on the one hand (the same semantic meaning), but on the other hand, they evaluate it differently (different connotations). Of course, do not forget that there may be exceptions in modern Russian speech. Thus, the adjective “красноречивый” can be expressed with sarcasm or irony and thus have a negative connotation.

Russian nouns can also perform a similar function. In Russian there is a noun “побасенка”. It can also characterize the subject from two sides, and also has two connotations - negative and positive. So a fable in the first meaning “короткий, занимательный рассказ”, in the second meaning – “сообщение, которое не заслуживает внимания” [12]. There is also a linguocultural connection, since the noun is based on the already mentioned verb “баять”. The diminutive suffix “-енк” may indicate an ironic, dismissive attitude. In the case of a negative connotation from the word “побасенка”, the word “краснобай” is formed, which characterizes a subject who can tell something beautifully, but his stories do not carry any meaning, they are empty.

Thus, predication in the Russian language is an interesting, unique phenomenon with strong linguistic and cultural ties. Above, examples and features of the predication of the Russian language in sentences, as well as in several parts of speech, were considered. It can be concluded that in the Russian language the characteristics of many subjects are simplified. There are non-verbal sentences that in other languages have a verb-bundle or are overloaded with other connecting parts of speech. Also, archaic words have many characteristics and connotations. A striking example of linguoculturological features of predication are phraseological units or phraseological units, but they were not given in the text of this article, since such linguistic units should be analyzed separately.

**Discussion.** Next, we will consider the linguistic and cultural features of the Uzbek language. In contrast to the Russian language, coordination in the Uzbek language weakly functions. This fact is indicated by such researchers of linguistics as A. Berdialiev and Kh. Makhmadov. Thus, adjectives in the Uzbek language always retain their original form. This can be demonstrated by the example of "yaxshi bola" (good child) and "yaxshi bollar" (good children) [13]. In this case, only nouns are inflected in the plural, while the adjective remains in its original form. Such a characteristic of the subjects may have a linguistic and cultural dependence. Analyzing the above example, it can be assumed that historically in the Uzbek language, preference is given to the subject, in this case the child (children). The characterization of the subject (adjective), therefore, does not require any special form to indicate the quality of the subject (s).

On the other hand, there are situations in the Uzbek language when harmonization plays an important role. Harmonization in Uzbek phrases is active when the personal pronouns of the first and second person are involved – “mening” (mine) and “sening” (your). This can also be explained from a linguistic and cultural point of view. In the culture of the Uzbek people, preference was given to subjects belonging to someone. Apparently, this moment was important in resolving any everyday issues or disputes between closely interacting subjects (residents from the same village, etc.).

During the analysis of the Russian language, non-verbal sentences were touched upon, which make up a significant part of written and oral speech. In the Uzbek language, such sentences are also a grammatical norm. Such sentences characterize the subjects, designate the personal qualities of a person. For example, the sentence “Ibroxim hasis” in translation means “Avraham the greedy” or “Abraham is stingy”. In this case, we see a specific characteristic of the subject without any linking verbs or additional parts of speech. Another sentence “Buning tarixi uzoq” in translation means “История этого далеко”. Here, too, no additional verbs were found, only the demonstrative pronoun was used.

As in Russian, in Uzbek there are verbal sentences with a comparative component. "Gulbadan bundan uch yosh kichik". Translated, this means "цветок моложе на три года". As in Russian, in Uzbek there are non-verbal sentences in which there is a temporal component: "Dunyoning ishlari hamisha chigal" - «Работы мира всегда смущены». As in the Russian language, among the non-verbal sentences of the Uzbek one encounters the local component “Hirotda Gavharshod begim madrasasi mashxur”. Translated, this means "Madrasah Gavharshod is well known in Gerart." [14].



It is quite possible to assume that the absence of a linking verb in the Uzbek sentences has a linguistic and cultural explanation. Similar proposals could have come to the Uzbek language as a result of the conquest of Central Asia by the Tatar-Mongols. As you know, in the Tatar language there are also non-verbal sentences that do not require linking verbs. It can also be assumed that for this reason the Uzbek people assimilated well with the Russians when Uzbekistan became part of the Russian Empire. An explanation can also be found in the fact that in Soviet times and to this day, many Uzbeks successfully learn Russian.

The similarity of the predication of the Uzbek and Russian languages is especially evident in the example of sentences where the predicate is expressed by an adjective. For example, the sentence “Bobur jim” in Russian is translated as “Бобур молчит”, but the characteristic “жим” is expressed in the Uzbek language not by a verb, but by an adjective. A similar example is the sentence “Men tirikmen”, which literally means “Я жив” or “Я живой”. As already noted, similar sentences are often found in the Russian language. It can be concluded that for the Uzbek language, due to the linguocultural influence of the Russian and Turkic languages on it, verbal sentences became the basis of predication.

As in Russian, in Uzbek there are one-part sentences in which “predicativity is expressed in one main term, which simultaneously names one or another object, phenomenon, action and establishes its relation to reality, which is achieved both by the forms of words and intonation means” [15]. For example, in the Uzbek language there is a sentence expressed in one word “Bormayman!” Translated, this means “He пойду!”. There are also sentences consisting of a pronoun that emphasizes the character [16]. You can also point to one-part sentences, which are expressed by a verb in an imperative mood. A sentence of this kind is expressed in one Uzbek word – “Borma!” (do not go). However, unlike Russian, there are practically no impersonal sentences in Uzbek. This testifies to the different mentality of the Uzbek people. Uzbeks, unlike Russians, do not tend to let everything take their course, not to take responsibility for what is happening.

An interesting feature of Uzbek predication is the fact that verbs in the past tense in sentences also have endings, like verbs in the future and present tense. This feature unites Uzbek with Russian.

In sentences like “Ha, tushundim” – “Да, понял” (in passing, let's pay attention to the fact that the speaker in Russian emphasizes his belonging to the masculine gender) or “Tushunmadim” – “Не понял”, it can be noted that they also lack subject. At the same time, in the Russian language, great importance is attached to the gender of the subject. The form of the verb is also taken into account, while in many European languages this point is omitted. It can be assumed that these ethnocultural

features are reflected in the language. Therefore, the gender of the subject is reflected in the verb forms. In the Uzbek language, the verb in the past tense has only a certain grammatical form without reference to gender. A similar feature of the Uzbek language also has cultural roots. The Uzbek mentality is characterized by respect for elders, adherence to family values, hospitality, but at the same time, special attention is not paid to the kind of subject.

**Conclusion.** Thus, this article is an attempt to search for linguoculturological connections in the predication of the Russian and Uzbek languages. In a comparative analysis, it was determined that the languages are similar to each other. This similarity is not surprising, since for a long time peoples existed in a single linguocultural space. Even today, the languages and cultures of the chosen peoples influence each other [17]. Of course, this similarity can be seen in the logic of predication. However, the mentality of the selected peoples differs in some aspects. This difference can also be seen when comparing predication in Russian and Uzbek. We can conclude that the topic of this article is relevant and requires new, deeper research.

### References:

1. Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. M.: Sov. Encyclopedia, 1966, p. 346.
2. Strawson P.F. About the reference // New in foreign linguistics. Issue XIII. Logic and Linguistics (Problems of Reference). M.: Raduga, 1982. S. 75.
3. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. M.: Sov. Encyclopedia, 1990. S. 393.
4. Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. Volgograd, 2002. S. 206.
5. Yakovleva E.S. On some features of the conceptualization of the personality principle in Russian vocabulary and grammar // Moscow University Bulletin. Ser. 9 Philology. 1997. No. 3. P. 97.
6. Vezhbitskaya A. Russian language. // Language. Culture. Cognition. M., 1996. S. 55-56.
7. Matesius V. On the systemic grammatical analysis // Prague linguistic circle. M., 1995. S. 237 - 238.
8. Profit I.I. English centensoids. Saratov. 1992.
9. Stepanov Yu.S. Foundations of General Linguistics. M., 1975. S. 379
10. Tarlanov Z.K. Nominative sentences in the history of the Russian language // Trends in the development of the Russian language. SPb., 2001. S. 196.

11. Akhmedzyanova A.R. Linguocultural features of Russian lexemes and phraseological units with speech semantics // Bulletin of the Mari State University. Yoshkar-Ola. 2017. No. 4 (28). P. 119.
12. Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language / ed. T.F. Efremova. 2009. 567 s
13. Chariev. Syntactic-semantic signs of the genitive case in the Uzbek and English languages. - Tashkent: Fan, 1990. S. 48 - 49.
14. Kodirov P. Saylanma: 3 zeldlik. Yulduzli Tunlar: A novel. Toshkent: Adabiyot va sanat nashriyoti, 1988, p. 286
15. Gvozdev A.N. Modern Russian literary language. M., 1961. P. 85.
16. Dzhuraev Sh.T. One-part definite personal sentences in Russian and Uzbek languages (to the problem of bilingualism) // Bulletin of modern science. 2016. No. 1-2 (13). P. 22.
17. Тоджибаева К. С. К. Педагогические и психологические особенности обучения взрослых // Academy. – 2018. – №. 1 (28).