

**On the Issue of the Contextual Dependence of Semi-Predicative Constructions  
(Based on the Material of Modern English and Tatar languages)**

**Rishat Zhurkenovich Saurbayev \***

Department of Foreign Philology, Toraighrov University, Kazakhstan

**Aliya Kozhamuratkyzy Zhetpispay**

Higher School of Humanities, Pavlodar Pedagogical University, Kazakhstan

**Ravil Aizovich Vafee**

Department of Foreign Philology, Toraighrov University, Kazakhstan

**Received on: 15-6-2022**

**Accepted on: 2-5-2023**

**Abstract**

This article examines the dependence of semi-predicative constructions on context. The dependence of these constructions is considered within the framework of the concepts of autosemanticity – synsemanticity, complicated sentences. The authors put forward the thesis that the contextual cohesion of a semi-predicative sentence is reflected in its semantics and structure. Analyzing the degree of contextual cohesion of the sentence, the paper comes to the conclusion that these constructions relate to the context in different ways. The functioning of a semi-predicative sentence without a full-predicative one, to which the analyzed constructions belong, is impossible. Therefore, their connection with the context can be characterized as having a high degree of strength. In the present study, synsemantic constructions are considered as syntactic constructions that have semantic connections with surrounding sentences, and autosemantic ones – as devoid of these connections.

**Keywords:** Autosemancy, Synsemancy, Semi-predicative construction, Contextual cohesion.

**1. Introduction**

The present study is devoted to the study of contextual and functional properties and features of semi-predicative constructions in two genetically and structurally unrelated languages i.e. Tatar and English. The Tatar language, one of the widely spoken languages of Russia, belongs to the Kypchak subgroup of the Turkic language group of the Altai language family. Consequently, it belongs to the agglutinative type in morphological structure. English, on the other hand, belongs to the Anglo-Frisian subgroup of the West Germanic languages of the Indo-European language family, and its structure belongs to the analytical type of languages. It is recognized that the comparative study of languages allows deeper insight into the peculiarities of each language, which is not always possible when studying one single language (Arakin 1989). At the same time, it is possible to identify and describe certain

---

© 2024 JJMLL Publishers/Yarmouk University. All Rights Reserved,

\* Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.16.3.1>

\* Corresponding Author: [rishat\\_1062@mail.ru](mailto:rishat_1062@mail.ru)

features of the compared languages that may slip away when studying one particular language. The significance of context as a factor revealing the significance of syntagmatic elements in the syntagmatic series is taken into account by all researchers of structures larger than the sentence (Moskalskaya 1981; Celce-Murcia 2016; Sedov 2016; Zaliznyak 2021). In linguistic works by Gulyga (1969), Admoni (1988), Arutyunova, Spiridonova (2003), Allan (2016), Newman (2016) Kruchinkina (2017) the dependence of the sentence on the context is considered within the concepts of autosemancy – synsemancy. The autosemanticity/synsemanticity of a sentence is determined by isolating it from the context. A sentence is considered autosemantic if it is characterized by semantic autonomy and does not lose its meaning when extracted from the context “Under the new Constitution are women to have votes?” he asked suddenly. “To have votes? Women? exclaimed the Vizier in some astonishment. (Munro, 50).

Synsemantic constructions are those whose content is found only in combination with other syntactic units For example, “Where are they?” ‘Back in in their holes, perhaps. I cleared. They made a rush for their holes’ (Wells, 213). ‘*I can tell that work means a great deal to you*’ “*It does*” (Brown, 42).

Thus, synsemantic constructions are considered syntactic constructions that have semantic connections with surrounding sentences, whereas autosemantic ones are considered as devoid of these connections. Autosemancy, understood as a meaningful independent and self-sufficient unit of language, is characterized not only by the self-comprehension of a part of the text (Galperin 1981). Autosemantic text fragments do not occupy a fixed position in texts. But there is a tendency to place them at the beginning or the end of the text. This tendency is especially evident in the newspaper text. Its position in the headings of the text is "thematic in nature", which is important in a newspaper text (Van Dyck 1989). This statement may take place in literary texts. For example, in some works of fiction, the autosemantic beginning is important, in which the names of the characters, the place, the time, and the nature of the action are usually reported. Some authors resort to autosemancy in the middle or the end of the text. In our opinion, the authors of the text consider themselves an object of reflection from the position of the recipient of information.

According to another researcher (Svyatogor 1973), the presence/absence of semantic connections cannot be considered a diagnostic feature in determining the autosemancy/synsemancy of sentences, since sentences that are completely independent of context are a very rare phenomenon. In fact, every sentence used in context is related to it in meaning. Autosemantic in this case will be considered sentences in which there is no indication of the need for mandatory combination with other syntactic units. Autosemantic sentences can exist out of context. Synsemantic sentences, on the other hand, are oriented toward mandatory use in context (Saurbayev 2011).

## **2. Literature review**

Among simple sentences, complicated ones stand out, which, according to the composition of predicative formations, do not just approach complex ones, but represent special forms of communication. Thus, they allow a compressed and closely and variously structured form to convey the

On the Issue of the Contextual Dependence of Semi-Predicative Constructions  
(Based on the Material of Modern English and Tatar languages)

information being communicated in certain portions and a certain hierarchy within the boundaries of a simple sentence.

In the studies by Degaltseva, Kormilitsyna, and Uzdinskaya (2016) and Priyatkina (2016), incomplete predicativity was accepted as a unifying feature of complicated formations. However, incomplete predicativity in itself is a very vast phenomenon, covering formations with varying degrees of actualization of predicativity, which was noted differently by Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky (1912), Potebnya (1958), and later, by recent work of (Saurbayev Tekzhanov, Ergaliyev and Amrenov 2013, Saurbayev 2013, Pereira 2015, Evstafiadi 2017, Al Jaradat, Almalahmeh 2021). Probably, a sufficiently convincing justification for this provided a broad understanding of the relatively recently introduced scientific use category of taxis, in particular dependent (cf. at least the predicativity of deverbatives and deadjectives noted by the authors). In this very wide space of predicativity, from the non-predicative (potentially predicative, asleep, demoted predicative) feature to the predicative, the formations considered in the work and others named above or some of them are significantly distinguished by the fact that their incomplete full predication is actualized by the corresponding secondary predication and one of the main means of its expression - the syntactic dissection of the formations under consideration (for example, in semi-predicative substantive formations of the type substantive + separate turnover), carried out with the help of isolation, compositional unions, and other means. As a result, a secondary – accompanying statement that receives its grammatical form also arises, and the complication reveals itself not only in structural but also in communicative and semantic aspects. Let us consider the given example; “*The old Metropole,*” brooded Mr. Wolfshiem gloomily. “*Filled with faces dead and gone. Filled with friends gone now forever.*” (Fitzgerald, 76) the author omits the name of the restaurant where they usually hung out. Only the name was a reminder of the past. Autosemantic constructions *Filled with faces dead and gone. Filled with friends gone now forever* add some information to the main sentence of “*The old Metropole,*” brooded Mr. Wolfshiem. Thus, semi-predicative complexes express communicative objectives and semantically expand the sentence, and not only expand it structurally.

Unlike most linguists, Efimenko and Sidorova (2018), and Riapkova (2022) considering the phenomena of auto- and synsemantic, bring to the fore the analysis of the properties of the auto- or synsemantic units themselves, in our opinion, it is not the units themselves that are important, but their contextual environment, their involvement in the textual structure, which seems quiet understandable. Arutyunova (2013) also enough carefully analyzes syntagmatic conditions of manifestation, for example, syntagmatically related, i.e. contextually conditioned secondary meanings. Our contribution to the theory of synsemanticity and autosemanticity is to consider them within the contextual presupposition, which is included in the semantics of any sentence as background knowledge of the communicants. Our research is based on some provisions of the paradigmatic syntax of Bloch (2000, 2004), it considers the concept of the derivational basis of a sentence, an extended sentence, and a sentence of a sentential generalized to the entire set of prepositive-paradigmatic forms, and two systems of sentence paradigmatics - predicative and constructive functions. The system of predicative functions is responsible for reflecting the connection of the nominative content of a sentence with reality. The system of structural functions is the formation of

sentences of varying complexity. The description of these systems ends with the nomination of formal criteria for evaluating the paradigmatic complexity of the sentence, consisting of the correlation of open syntagmatically expressed predication units forming the sentence with the predication units embedded in its derivational basis. Blokh's concept of syntactic paradigmatics (Blokh 1977) has led to the creation of the theory of paradigmatic syntax, which implements the system principle of its description at the present stage of language cognition.

As we have already pointed out, the paradigmatic syntax has its roots in the mathematical theory of generative grammar, which revealed fundamentally new provisions of the syntax of nuclear sentences and their transformations.

This theory refracts the position in the system-linguistic description, in terms of syntactic derivation of the sentence, on which various processes of speech formation are based.

Paradigmatic syntax distinguishes the form and paradigm of a sentence, putting them in a certain parallel with the form and paradigm of a word. The condition for a stricter definition of the sentence paradigm is the preservation of uniform principles of selection at the level of morphology and syntax. A similar attempt to show the paradigm of the proposal was made on the material of the Russian language by Worth (1961).

The theory of the binary comparative approach of Vafeev (2000; 2010) is used in comparative linguistics to study both similar and distinctive units of comparison, within which we can consider their distinctive features, the so-called "unicalia". This theory is connected with the concept of opposites in the lexical and grammatical system of the language. This concept of binary opposition is the logical opposition "subject-predicate" for a more detailed study of the grammatical opposition "subject-predicate". Thus, in the oppositional system, oppositions assume not only signs differentiating the members of the proposal from each other but also unifying certain signs for both members of the opposition. The connection of the subject and the predicate reflects the dialectic of the relationship between the individual and the general in the material world. On the one hand, their unity is that they cannot exist without each other; each of them separately does not constitute a judgment. On the other hand, they are in opposition to each other, i.e. they oppose each other as a single and common. Consideration of autosemancy and synsemancy, and their dependence on context through binary comparison and paradigmatic relations reveal implicit connections between clauses creating a structural and semantic construction.

Magomedov's research (2006) is a comprehensive analysis of interrelated and mutually dependent semantic and syntactic constructions based on the detection of semantic models and the functional mechanism of verbal lexemes considering their dependence and independence within the context.

The issue of synsemancy and autosemancy was also raised in Bondarenko's dissertation research (2003), where this linguistic phenomenon was considered within the framework of verbal constructions in the system of the functional-semantic field state change.

The greatly increased interest in the text over the past decades Kruchinkina (2017), Berezovska-Savchuk (2017), and Asma (2022) in particular in its communicative aspect, does not deny the

On the Issue of the Contextual Dependence of Semi-Predicative Constructions  
(Based on the Material of Modern English and Tatar languages)

significance of the further study of the sentence, in particular, because the text is built from variants of communicative paradigms of sentences, that is, from sentences. The speaker's verbal intention associated with the communication of information and other functions determines the choice of existing syntactic units and various means. Such units are primarily predicative' units expressing certain predications - a simple and complex sentence.

### 3. Methodology

The following methodological approaches were used in our research: paradigmatic-semantic and contextual-functional approaches. The paradigmatic-semantic approach at the sentence level that we use in our study is formed not by the same sentence taken in different forms, but by obviously different sentences representing the variability of the same significant propositive model. We use the contextual-functional approach that is mainly related to the direction of language learning from meaning to form and function. Such a system-integrating view of language forms a concentric model of the language system. It is based on the traditional level structure of language, but goes from the meaning to the ways of its expression and then to its function in speech. We considered semi-predicative constructions within the framework of contextual dependence. The contrastive method consists in identifying and comparing typologically similar and dissimilar phenomena belonging to the same category, in our study we use this method to identify unique and universal features in the compared languages within the category of autosemancy and synsemancy. The study of the linguistic phenomenon is conducted in contrast lighting, by using contrastive-typological method.

We use the contextual-functional approach, mainly related to the direction of language learning from meaning to form and function. Such a system-integrating view of language forms a concentric model of the language system. It is based on the traditional level structure of language, but goes from the meaning to the ways of its expression and then to its function in speech. We considered semi-predicative constructions within the framework of contextual dependence. The contrastive method consists in identifying and comparing typologically similar and dissimilar phenomena belonging to the same category, in our study we use this method to identify unique and universal features in the compared languages within the category of autosemancy and synsemancy. The study of the linguistic phenomenon is conducted in contrast lighting, by using the contrastive-typological method.

### 4. Findings

Let us consider these provisions in the example of a complex sentence consisting of independent sentences combined with the help of one of the semantic varieties of the connective links – the predicative line.

‘Hullo, Cade, so you’re back again. Been hearing all about last night’s little show?’

“Yes”, said Anthony. “Rather an exciting weekend, isn’t it”. (Christie, 132)

The first sentence in the above example is characterized by relative independence. It is relatively easy to stand out from the context while maintaining its content “*Hullo, Cade, so you're back again*”, in

this example we found a full-predicative line expressed by the subject-predicative relations *you're back again (you came back again)*. The second sentence is semi-predicative – synsemantic, which is proved by the impossibility of isolating “*Been hearing all about last night's little show?*”, where the second sentence, expressed by a semi-predicative participial complex, complements the previous sentence and is dependent on it, that is, synsemantic. There is no doubt that the first sentence also depends on the context. But the degree of dependence and the degree of connectedness of these two sentences with the context is different. Analysis of any text reveals the presence of sentences that are difficult to isolate from the context, isolation of some sentences is completely unacceptable. Let us consider a similar phenomenon in the Tatar language:

Uzebezg kil, ani! Bezdän sina ber eš ta bulmayachak. (Khosaenov, 93) (Come to us, Mom! We will give you one job).

In the above example, a sentence with a semi-predicative complex expressed by the future participle *bulmayachak (giving)* has a more autonomous character. Thus, it is autosemantic, because being semi-predicative in its semantics and it accumulates signs of a full-predicative structure.

Thus, it is possible to establish several degrees of contextual cohesion of sentences depending on the degree of weakening of contextual inter-propositional links. The above example from English can serve as an illustration of this position. Analyzing the degree of contextual cohesion of two sentences of the English language, we conclude that they relate to the context in different ways. The functioning of a semi-predicative sentence without a full-predicative one, to which the semi-predicative complex belongs, is impossible. Therefore, its connection with the context can be characterized as having a high degree of strength.

As for the Tatar language, the degree of cohesion of the semi-predicative complex with the full-predicative is low, since the languages of the agglutinative type have a greater degree of autosemanticism of structures of the semi-predicative type, since they accumulate the semantics of the full-predicative sentence. The relationship between a semi-predicative complex and a full-predicative one falls under the definition of "determination" (Elmslev 2006), that is, there is a one-sided dependence: one dependent part of a semi-predicative complex implies another full-predicative one.

Let us consider another example: “*But, excuse me, Mr. Cade, you have been away.*”

“With a string tied to my leg. I’ve no doubt that I was shadowed the whole time. I shouldn’t have been given the chance of disposing of the revolver or anything of that kind.” (A. Christie, 133)

A semi-predicative sentence *With a string tied to my leg* is characterized by a high degree of contextual cohesion, which may indicate that it is impossible to isolate it from the context. In this example, it acts as a separate application to the sentence with the full-predicative line *I’ve no doubt that I was shadowed the whole time*.

The essential thing here is that as a syntactic unit, a semi-predicative sentence expressed by a separate application is characterized by a high degree of synsemanticity: it necessarily appears in the form of an appendix or supplement to the main utterance. In the Tatar language, as indicated above, the degree of

On the Issue of the Contextual Dependence of Semi-Predicative Constructions  
(Based on the Material of Modern English and Tatar languages)

cohesion of semi-predicative sentences with the main one is low. However, this position is not always an axiom for language, since the degree of cohesion depends on the most autonomous and autosemantic participles to less autonomous and more synsemantic adverbial participles. Let us give an example: *Shulai bulmycha! Kunelsezlana bashlasa, uzena kibettan ber babi alyp kaityp birerbez – tik uynap utyrsyn!* (*It won't be like that! If she is in no mood, then we will buy her "the child" in the store – let him sit and play!*) (Khosayenov, 87). In this example, the semi-predicative sentence expressed by the adverbial part of *Shulai bulmych* (without being) is contextually dependent on the subsequent one represented by the full-predicative line. Thus, the adverbial clause is synsemantic concerning similar semi-predicative participial clauses in which the degree of cohesion is lower.

The property of non-predicative constructions should likely manifest itself in their structure. Studying synsemantic units, researchers note that they have so-called "synsemantic signals" (Avganova 1975, 181), that is, their structure contains units that indicate the need for use in context. Some authors (e.g. Kibrik 1969; Kolshansky 2007 and Saurbayev 2013) attribute to the signals of synsemancy all means of communication of sentences at the supra-phasal level; others recognize this property only for individual means of communication. They usually perform a double function: they indicate the synsemancy of a given sentence and are means of predicative communication, which in a sentence is combined into one semantic and structural whole.

In semi-predicative sentences, the signals of synsemancy are participial, gerundial, and infinitival complexes.

For example:

*'Listen to me, Bill. Proposing to me is your idée fixe. All men propose when they're bored and can't think of anything to say. Remember my age and my widowed state, and go and make love to a pure young girl.'*

*On the way back, he passed Anthony on the road and stopped. "Going to give me a lift back to the house?" asked Anthony. "That's good."*

*"Where have you been, Mr. Cade?"*

*"Down to the station to inquire about trains."*

*Battle raised his eyebrows.*

*"Thinking of leaving us again?" he inquired. (Christie, 158)*

Semi-predicative sentences are signals of synsemancy due to some of their features. One of them is that to implement a semi-predicative sentence, it needs to rely on other units of the text that are more specific in meaning.

For example:

*Standing probably on a quiet street with a rose arbour at the side and plenty of flowers in front. (R. Chandler, 142)*

Thus, a semi-predicative sentence taken out of context, expressed by a participle, does not give complete information about what was standing on a quiet street, although using background knowledge, we restore an implicitly unexpressed subject. The left environment of *An old house, built as once they*

*built them and don't build them anymore and the right environment of Gracious and cool and quite in the bright Californian sun* gives us a complete picture of what the author is talking about. Thus, we found that semi-predicative sentences are contextually dependent and are means of predicative communication while being synsemantic units.

Let us consider a similar phenomenon in the Tatar speech:

*Ber-ike kon shaharda kagylyp-sugylyp yorgach. (M. Magdiev p.248) (For one or two days he walked aimlessly wandering around the city).* In the example above, the semi-predicative sentence expressed by the adverbial complex *kagylyp-sugylyp yorgach* (wandering) requires contextual completion, which is restored when the left environment of *Rushad April aenda diploma yaklada* (*Rushad defended his diploma in April.*) and the right environment of *Ul anise yana kaytty* (*he returned to his mother.*) are supplemented.

So, in the Tatar language, as well as in English a semi-predicative sentence is a synsemantic unit that requires context.

The signals of synsemancy also include structural incompleteness of the structure. But there is no unambiguous correspondence between structurally complete and autosemantic sentences. The completeness of the syntactic construction does not always indicate its independence from the context. Most structurally complete sentences, when extracted from the context, either lose their meaning or become ambiguous. Kibrik (1969), and Kolshansky (2007) wrote about the existence of sentences that are complete in form, but incomplete in content and therefore in need of contextual addition. Roslovets (1968) in his opinion, the completeness of the formal composition of the proposal is still insufficient to judge its semantic sufficiency and autonomy. The presence of a complete formal composition in itself cannot serve as a criterion of contextual independence.

Let us analyze the following sentence “*I will throw it up to you.*” (Christie, 192)

Thus, we find that the sentence in question is a structurally complete unit, and we can also talk about semantic completeness since it performs its communicative task without requiring additional semantic load. However, it is a syntactic unit that requires context. The pronoun *it*, is a signal of synsemancy due to some semantic meaning and needs contextual addition.

You can give another example where a contextual environment is needed to fulfill the missing information: *Imogen offered me some.* (Galsworthy, 198). Only the context includes a predicative connection with the preceding sentences.

*So, have you had dinner?*

“*No*”

“*Would you like some?*”

*He shrugged his shoulders.*

“*Imogen offered me some. I didn't want any.*” (Galsworthy p.198)

A similar phenomenon is observed in the Tatar language:

*Yahshylykka bulmas bu...*



On the Issue of the Contextual Dependence of Semi-Predicative Constructions  
(Based on the Material of Modern English and Tatar languages)

*Zhiter sesge! (All this is not good... That's enough for you!)*

*(Ya. Zankiev)*

An adjunctive construction *Yahshylykka bulmas (being not good!)* expressing a semi-predicative connection and complicating the structural and semantic structure of a sentence can act, in contrast to a fully predicative one, as an autonomous unit, for example:

*Her voice has a most extraordinary effect on me. That Irish voice! (Shaw p.93)*

The first part of this sentence is expressed by a full-predicative line, while the second is an adjunctive construction, which is connected by a semi-predicative connection with the main statement. Semantically and structurally, this construction is a continuation of the first part, which is undoubtedly one of the components of the complication of a simple sentence. The connecting construction “*That the Irish voice*” is an autosemantic unit, since it can express an independent judgment. In the compared language, similar phenomena are found when the connecting construction is an autosemantic unit, as in the case of the English language. This proves the universal nature of this phenomenon.

## 5. Results and Discussion

There is no one clear definition of predication in modern linguistics. Currently, there are more than three hundred definitions of this phenomenon. The subject-predicate dyad, which was usually applied to all units of language functioning in the language system as complete semantic units, gave rise to two contradictory positions in linguistic science. On the one hand, many constructions were recognized as having the ability to express meaning within the framework of the subject-predicate model, but, on the other hand, they were denied the right to be a structurally full-fledged unit of language, although deviating in its structure from the subject-predicate structure.

Predication should be considered a distinctive feature of speech communication, as a property and a prerequisite for any sentence's existence. Recognizing the importance of the category of full predication revealing the essence of a sentence, the authors of many studies are not so unanimous in defining the category of predication itself. As Raspopov notes, "... a very contradictory interpretation of this category ultimately led to the fact that the corresponding concept, in essence, lost its meaning" (Raspopov 1981, 126).

Thus, the traditional concept of predication is closely associated with the presence of the finite form of the verb in the sentence and is identified with the predicate. However, this interpretation can be disputed. Let us assume that the only possible way to express predication is the morphological way. In this case, it will be necessary to recognize constructions without a finite verb form as non-propositional statements, constructions of a random occasional nature. This conclusion, in our opinion, is contradicted by the results of existing studies of sentences without a finite verb form, which indicates the illegality of such an approach to the study of the nature of predication, which allows the latter to be denied the status of a sentence.

Roslovetz rightly believes that it would be erroneous to associate the category of predication only with verbal constructions, considering "the verb is the only grammatical means of organizing a proposal" (Roslovetz, 1968).

The predicate is one of the main means of expressing predication. The predicate as an exponent of grammatical predication has various connections in the sentence. Thus, Smirnitsky (1956) defines a predication as a word or a combination of words to denote a predicate. The subject is understood by him as the object of thought concerning which the predicate is thought, defined, and distinguished. The definition of both concepts – subject, and predicate – through the subject of thought, in our opinion, is controversial and introduces ambiguity into the problem of studying the relationship between subject and predicate as a general linguistic category.

More correct, in our opinion, is the understanding of the predicate as such a member of a two-part sentence, which usually expresses primary predication and contains new information, that is, the rhyme of the sentence; having the property of forming an utterance, it enters into the structural scheme of the sentence, contains a modal-temporal characteristic.

Speaking about the variety of predicate connections in a sentence, we, first of all, mean its eponymous connection with some sentence members: subject, object, and circumstance.

A broad understanding of predication as a grammatical category that determines the attribution of the nominative content of an utterance to objective reality does not allow it to be delimited only by the relations between the subject and the predicate on the sole grounds that two-part sentences are a structural type corresponding to the two-component structure of the judgment. Thus, a logical two-component does not at all imply the coincidence of the subject with the subject of the judgment. The predicate of judgment always contains new information and is the bearer of the new in the act of cognition.

Considering the structure of the sentence as a form of expression of the subject-predicative logeme, it is necessary to investigate the phenomenon of grammatical opposition, reflecting in the linguistic form the organic connection of the subject and the predicate. Predicative communication is oppositive, not connective or connecting concepts since it splits a single thought into two opposite moments. The logical concepts of "subject" and "predicate" should be compared, but not identified with the grammatical concept of subject and predicate.

At the surface level, predication is characteristic not only of the predicate but also of other members of the sentence. Predicativity, in our opinion, is not identical to the concept of the predicate, the first is much broader. The means of expressing predication are very diverse. These include universal means of expression: intonation, personal and non-personal forms of the verb (finite and non-finite), and a verbless or so-called implicit verbal expression of predication, which introduces a special shade of meaning into the sentence. Thus, a sentence always contains a subject and a predicate, but at the surface level (syntagmatic) they may not be explicated. In a sentence, the subject and predicate can be represented by the subject and predicate. This shows the specificity of the sentence structure, which is not identical to the structure of the judgment.

On the Issue of the Contextual Dependence of Semi-Predicative Constructions  
(Based on the Material of Modern English and Tatar languages)

Predication forms the basis of any sentence and is its mandatory component. Semi-predication is one of the main varieties of additional predication, which is the relationship between an intonationally isolated nominal construction and any substantively expressed member of a sentence (subject, object, circumstance).

Ways of expressing semi-predication: participial construction, adjectival construction, substantive construction, application. Let us give examples of different ways of expressing semi-predication: *"Sensing my dislike of the room, Lord Penrose laughed"* (J.W. Brown, 42). *"With a quick word of gratitude, I followed him up the wide, sweeping staircase, trying to take in the beauty of the great white marble hall"* (Brown, 13)

In semi-predicative constructions, there is the meaning of time and subjective modality. Their meanings may be implicitly expressed, as in the examples given, or expressed by lexical means.

Connective constructions that complicate the structural and semantic construction of a sentence have a so-called predicative meaning since they perform the function of explanation in the sentence structure, that is, the predicative meaning of the sentence appears on the semantic basis of grammatical predicativity. The concept of the predicative meaning of a sentence is one of the ways to study the contextual connectedness of a sentence.

The contextual dependence of sentences can be investigated based on the presupposition theory. The concept of "presupposition" arose in linguistics due to the need to take into account in the study of linguistic material what creates the premise of any utterance. The verbally non-expressed content of a sentence, its presupposition, can be carried out in different ways: by the previous experience of the speaker and the listener, by the situation and context.

For linguistic research, in our opinion, the contextual presupposition, which is included in the semantics of the sentence as the background knowledge of the speaker or listener, should be of the greatest interest. Researchers (Kibrik 1969, Kolshansky 2004) of the text note that its semantic structure overlaps with each other, as a result of which a presuppositional background is formed.

In some studies, presupposition and context indication should be distinguished. In this scenario, the presupposition is understood as the semantic component of a sentence, which remains unchanged when the entire statement contained in the sentence is negated. In this paper, the presupposition is understood as contextually created prerequisites, which is a necessary condition for the functioning of semi-predicative sentences. For example, a semi-predicative construction of a complicated sentence refers to a presupposition:

*Pushing open the door, Roger ushered me inside the room.* (Brown) The presuppositional part in this sentence is Pushing open the door, since the door was open, Roger was able to take me into the room, and the condition was expressed by a semi-predicative sentence.

Consider the following semi-predicative sentence: *"Suppose someone wanted badly to prevent your going to Chimneys?" "My cousin George Lomax does," said Virginia with a smile* (Christie, 64). In this example, only the context can explain why the trip could not take place, which was the reason that the author of the statement had to postpone the trip.

The presupposition of semi-predicative sentences can be not only the preceding but also subsequent sentences. For example: *Convincing Miss Marsden as to the propriety of the journey to Falmouth proved to be the most difficult* (Brown, 53).

In this case, for an adequate understanding, a semi-predicative sentence should include the information contained in the subsequent sentence. *I finally told her that I would take all responsibility concerning it – and why did she not come, too?*

Let us consider this phenomenon in the Tatar language:

*Echegez, suytmycha gyna! – dide ul? Karshy ma utryu belan ?* (Eniki, 123) (*Drink without cooling down!*). Thus, the polypredicative sentence *Echegez, suytmycha gyna* (*Drink without cooling down!*.) is presuppositional for a full-predicative sentence, preceding it.

The presupposition precedes the semi-predicative sentence *Shulai da ul kechken podnos belan ike stakan kue chay, ike pirozhniy ham ber uch chamasy konfet kiterde* (*So, he was carrying two strong teas, two cakes and two or three sweets on a tray*). Thus, both in English and the comparable Tatar language, a semi-predicative sentence includes as presupposition already available information from the previous presentation. This determines the dependence of the sentence on the context.

The high degree of contextual dependence of semi-predicative sentences is a consequence of the fact that they include a preposition connected to them by a predicative connection. The synsemancy of a semi-predicative sentence is reflected in its semantics and structure.

## 6. Conclusion

Thus, both for English and for the comparing Tatar language, the semi-predicative sentence includes the phenomenon of the presupposition that refers to available information from the previous presentation. Probably, this property of this syntactic construction determines the dependence of the sentence on the context. The high degree of contextual dependence of semi-predicative sentences is a consequence of the fact that it is considered through a presupposition connected to it by a predicative connection. The synsemancy of a semi-predicative sentence is reflected in its semantics and structure in the compared languages. In our opinion, the synsemancy of semi-predicative constructions is woven into the fabric of the text, forming a single structural and semantic whole with it, complementing information, and forming a common whole-formed utterance with a general meaning. It considers universal for languages of any type and any structure. The functioning of polypredicative constructions outside the main predicative core is impossible, so we state the fact that the dependence of such constructions on the context is extremely high

حول مسألة الاعتماد السياقي للإنشاءات شبه المسندة

(استناداً إلى مواد اللغة الإنجليزية الحديثة ولغات التتار)

ريشات زوركينوفيتش سوربايف

قسم اللغة الأجنبية، جامعة تورايغروف، كازاخستان

علياء كوزاموراتكيي زيتيبسباي

المدرسة العليا للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة بافلودار التربوية، كازاخستان

رافيل آيزوفيتش فافي

قسم فقه اللغة الأجنبية، جامعة تورايغروف، كازاخستان

الملخص

تتناول هذه المقالة اعتماد الإنشاءات شبه التنبؤية على السياق، وينظر إلى اعتماد هذه التركيبات في إطار مفاهيم القدرة الذاتية، الجملة المعقدة، طرح المؤلفون أطروحة مفادها أن التماسك السياقي للجملة شبه التنبؤية ينعكس في دلالاتها وبنيتها، بتحليل درجة التماسك السياقي للجملة، وتوصل المؤلفون إلى استنتاج مفاده أن هذه التركيبات مرتبطة بالسياق بطرق مختلفة، ومن المستحيل تشغيل جملة شبه تنبؤية بدون جملة تنبؤية كاملة، التي تنتمي إليها التركيبات التي حُلَّت؛ لذلك يمكن وصف ارتباطهم بالسياق بأنه يتمتع بدرجة عالية من القوة، إذ يعد المؤلفون التراكم المترادفة على أنها بنائيات نحوية لها روابط دلالية مع الجمل المحيطة، والبناءات التلقائية على أنها خالية من هذه الروابط.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** أوتوسيمانسي، سينسيمانسي، البناء شبه المسند، التماسك السياقي.

## References

- Admoni, Vladimir. 1988. *The Grammatical System as a System of Construction and General Theory of Grammar*. Leningrad: 240.
- Allan, Keith. 2016. A History of Semantics. *The Routledge handbooks in linguistics*, Ed. N.Riemer. N-Y.: 48-68.
- Arakin, Vladimir. 1989. *Typology of Languages and the Problem of Methodological Forecasting*, Moscow: 157.
- Arutyunova, Nina, and Nataliya, Spiridonova. 2003. *Logical Analysis of Language. Selected Works*. 1988—1995.
- Arutyunova, Nina. 2013. *The Sentence and Its Meaning. Logical and Semantic Problems*. Moscow: 316.
- Asma, Asaad Thamer. 2022. Discourse Markers In Selected. English Editorials: A Communicative Aspect between Text Producers and Receivers. *International Journal on Humanities and Social Sciences. Al-Iraqia University*: 215-226.
- Avganova, N.A. 1975. On the Contextual Dependence of Sentences United by an Evaluative Relationship. *Questions of the theory of the English language*. Moscow: 179-186.
- Berezovska-Savchuk. 2017. Specifics of the Organization of the Semantic Category of Status in the Ukrainian Language. *Lexical and grammatical innovations in modern Slavic languages*. Dnipro: 11-13
- Bloch, Mark. 1977. *Problems of paradigmatic syntax: (Based on the material of the English language)*. Dissertation of Doctor of Philology: USSR Academy of Sciences. Institute of Linguistics. - Moscow: 740.
- Blokh, Mark. 2000. *A Course in English Theoretical Grammar*: 394.
- Blokh, Mark. 2004. Theoretical foundations of grammar. "Higher School": 230.
- Bondarenko, Svetlana. 2003. *Functional-semantic category of state change: verb constructions of the English language*. Ph.D. thesis, Moscow: 2000
- Brown, Joan. 1987. *Penross Manor*. Reading: 187.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne, and Elite, Olshtain. 2010. *Discourse context in language teaching*. Cambridge: 279.
- Chandler, R. *Farewell, My Lovely*. Penguin: 320.
- Christie, Agatha. 2022. *The Secret of Chimneys*. Bibliotech Press: 210.
- Degaltseva, Kormilitsyna, and Uzdinskayaю 2016. *Modern Russian language. Syntax*. Saratov: 68.
- Efimenko, I. N., and T. P. Sidorova 2018. Autosemantic relevance of the duration/repeatability component when updating aspectual values. *At the intersection of languages and cultures. Current issues of humanitarian knowledge Scientific and methodological journal № 3(12)*: 38-44
- Elmslev, L. 2006. *Prolegomena to the theory of language*. Moscow: "Linguistic heritage of the XX century": 248.
- Eniki, Amirkhan.1978. *Gulyandam: Novel*, Kazan: 176.

On the Issue of the Contextual Dependence of Semi-Predicative Constructions  
(Based on the Material of Modern English and Tatar languages)

- Evstafiadi, O.V. 2017. Transformations in the translation of English semi-predicative conditional constructions into Russian. *Bulletin of the Orenburg University #2 (202):* 71-75.
- Fitzgerald, Francis Scott. 2013. *The Great Gatsby*. Lennex Corp: 193.
- Galperin, Iliya. 1981. Text as an object of linguistic research. Moscow: 98-105.
- Galsworthy, John. *Saga of Foresides: In Chancery*. Wordsworth Classic: 722.
- Gulyga, Elena. 1969. On the question of the interrelation of levels (linguistic macro- and microfields). *Linguistics and methodology in higher school. Issue 4.* – Moscow: 13-22
- Al Jaradat, Hamed and Almalahmeh, Mohammad. (2021). The Syntax of the Epistemic Modal *kaan* in Jordanian Arabic. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures* Vol.15, No. 1, 2023: 287-303.
- Khosaenov, Sharif. 1981. *Longing for love*. Kazan: 212.
- Kibrik, Aleksandr. 1969. *On the hierarchical structure of the meaning of a linked text*. Problems of language modeling. Tartu: 174-189.
- Kolshansky, Gennady. 2007. *Contextual semantics*. Moscow: 149.
- Kruchinkina, Nadezhda. 2017. Synsemantics of the verb lexeme in the sentence. *Comparative Linguistics*, No. 6.
- Magdiev, Mukhamed. 1973. *Front-line soldiers*. Kazan: 328
- Magomedova, Patimat. (2006). *Semantics and syntax of the Avar verb: the experience of semantic interpretation of syntax*. Dissertation: Doctor of Philology. Moscow: 427.
- Moskalskaya, Olga. 1981. *Grammar of the text*. Moscow: 183.
- Munro, Hector. 1993. *The Collected Short Stories of Saki*. Wordsworth Classics: 494.
- Newman, John. 2016. Semantic shift. *The Routledge Handbook of Semantics*. Ed. N.Riemer. N-Y.: 266-280.
- Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, D.N. 1912. *Syntax of the Russian language* St. Petersburg.
- Potebnya, A.A. 1958. *From notes on Russian grammar—* Moscow, Enlightenment, T.I-II
- Priyatkina, Alla. 2016. The Russian language. The syntax of a semi-complicated sentence.
- Raspopov, I. 1981. A few remarks about the so-called semantic structure of the sentence. *Questions on linguistics*. No. 4: 24-34.
- Riapkova, E. 2022. Semantic-syntactic units of the text. *The Scientific Heritage #84:* 55-57.
- Roslovets, Ya. 1968. Nominative emotional and evaluative sentences in the Russian language. *Russian language and Soviet society*. Moscow: 278 – 287.
- Saurbayev, Rishat. 2011. Contextual semantics of semi-predicative sentences (based on the material of English and Tatar languages). *Scientific and Technical Bulletin of the St. Petersburg State Polytechnic University. Humanities and Social Sciences* No.2: 171-175.
- Saurbayev, R.Zh., Tekzhanov, K.Kh., Ergaliyev, K.S., and Amrenov, A.D. 2013. On the Issue Structure-Semantic and Predicative Features of Semi-Composite Sentences and Their Functions in the Bounds of Paradigmatic Syntax. *Life Science Journal; 10 (4):* 1042-1050.

- Saurbayev, R. Zh. 2013. The Tagseme as a Component of Structural-Semantic Complexification of the Sentence, *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*. 16 (3) Publications: 432-436.
- Sedov, Konstantin. 2016. General and anthropocentric Linguistics. Moscow: 438.
- Shaw, Bernard. John Bull's Other Island.
- Sílvia, Alfonso Pereira 2015. Predicative Constructions with Gerunds in European Portuguese dialects. *Dialectologia* Special issue: 351-371
- Svyatogor, I. 1976. The smallest utterances as the subject of the syntax of related speech. *Linguistic disciplines on the facts of Russian language and literature*. Moscow: 62-69.
- Vafeev, Ravil. 2000. Bilateral Tatar-Russian bilingualism and binary co-delivery of languages: doctoral dissertation: 378.
- Vafeev, Ravil. 2010. Interaction of languages in bilingualism. *Philological space of the Tyumen region: a collection of scientific articles*. Tyumen: 215-222.
- Van Dyke. 1989. Structures of discourse and structures of power. *Annals of the International Communication Association*. Volume 12, 1989 - Issue 1: 18-59.
- Wells, Herbert. 2018. The Food of the Gods and How It Came to Earth. T8: 308.
- Worth, Din. 1961. Transformation criteria for the classification of predicative genitive constructions in Russian. *Linguistics, EARLMT*.
- Zaliznyak, Anna. 2021. Research on Russian and comparative semantics. Moscow: 548.
- Zankiev, Yakub. 1994. Dawns over the Irtysh. Novel. Kazan: 671