

Shokhida Khujamova Student of Termez branch of Tashkent State
Pedagogical University named after Nizami
SEMANTIC FEATURES OF VERBS IN PRESENT DAY ENGLISH
Sh. Khujamova

Abstract: Semantically verbs divide into notional and semi-notional. Some linguists speak also of a third group, auxiliary verbs, completely devoid of lexical meaning, as, for instance, *has* in *has written*. As shown, they are words in form only. As to their meaning and function they are grammatical morphemes, parts of analytical words. Hence the name grammatical word- morphemes. The class of verbs falls into a number of subclasses distinguished by different semantic lexico-grammatical features[1].

The majority of English verbs are notional, i. e. possessing full lexical meaning. Connected with it is their isolatability, i.e. the ability to make a sentence alone (*Come! Read!*). Their combinability is variable. Semi-notional verbs have very general, 'faded' lexical meanings, as in *be, have, become, seem, can, may, must, etc.*, where the meaning of action is almost obliterated. Semi-notional verbs are hardly isolatable. Their combinability is usually bilateral as they serve to connect words in speech. They are comparatively few in number, but of very frequent occurrence, and include two peculiar groups: link-verbs and modal verbs.

Keywords: action verbs, types of verbs, lexico-grammatical sense, Construction Grammar approach.

On the basis of the subject-process relation all the notional verbs be divided into actional and statal.

Actional verbs express the action performed by the subject. To this class belong such verbs as *do, act, make, go, read, learn, discover, etc.*

State verbs denote the state of their subject. To this subclass belong such verbs as *be, five, survive, worry, suffer, see, know, etc.* They usually occur in the simple form in all tenses. They are not generally used in progressive forms. But if there are used so there any change of meaning. E.g.: *Oh, it hurts! — Oh, it's hurting!* Semi-notional verbid introducer verbs are distributed among the verbal sets of discriminatory relational semantics (*seem, happen, turn out, etc.*), of subject-action relational semantics (*try, fail, manage, etc.*), of phrasal semantics (*begin, stop, continue, etc.*). The predicator verbs should be strictly distinguished from their grammatical homonyms in the subclasses of notional verbs. As a matter of fact, there is fundamental grammatical difference between the verbal constituents in such sentences as, say, *"They began to fight"* and *"They began the fight"*. Where the verb in the first sentence is a semi-notional predicator, the verb

in the second sentence is a notional transitive verb normally related to its direct object. The phrasal predicator *begin* (the first sentence) is grammatically inseparable from the infinitive of the notional verb *fight*, the two lexemes making one verbal-part unit in the sentence. The transitive verb *begin* (the second sentence), on the contrary, is self-dependent in the lexico-grammatical sense, it forms the predicate of the sentence by itself and as such can be used in the passive voice, the whole construction of the sentence in this case being presented as the regular passive. On the upper level of division two unequal sets are identified: the set of verbs of full nominative value (notional verbs), and the set of verbs of partial Semi-notional and functional verbs nominative value (semi-notional and functional verbs). The first set is derivationally open, it includes the bulk of the verbal lexicon. The second set is derivationally closed it includes limited subsets of verbs characterized by individual relational properties.

The *Construction Grammar* approach sheds a particularly clear and insightful light on this interaction; let us present here some of its aspects, relevant to the verb semantic class system[2]. The first point concerns the nature of the verb semantics, the nature of the semantics of a construction and the characterization of the interactions between these two elements. The second point concerns the meaning relations between constructions. These elements are of much importance for lexicalization and the construction of propositions[3].

Verbs usually have a central use, characterized by a specific syntactic form, but they may also be used with a large variety of other syntactic forms. In this case, the meaning of the proposition may be quite remote from the initial meaning of the verb. Let us consider a few illustrative cases. In:

Edith baked Mary a cake.

The initial sense of *bake* becomes somewhat marginal, in favor of a more global meaning:

There is not here a special sense of *bake* which is used, but *bake* describes a kind of “manner” of giving Mary a cake.

Consider now the case of *slide*, suggested by B. Levin. ^From the two following sentences:

Edith slid Susan/ the door the present.*

Edith slid the present to Susan/to the door.

One may conclude that there are two senses for *slide* (probably very close). The first sense would constrain the goal to be animate while the second would have no constraint. Now, if we insist, in the ditransitive construction, that the goal must be animate, then we can postulate just one sense for *slide*, which is intuitively more conceptually appropriate. We then need to posit constraints in the alternations on the nature of the arguments which would then allow only those verbs which meet the constraints to

undergo that alternation. As noticed very early by Lakoff, a verb alone (and its associated lexical semantics) cannot be used to determine whether a construction is acceptable, it is necessary to take into account the semantics of the arguments. There is of course some semantic background for the distinction of verbs. Prototypically, verbs (such as *sleep, stay, hit, give*) denote temporally changing entities (events or states) in which one or more objects are participating.

However, the classification into verbs is not purely semantic-driven. Given the rich conceptual variation into punctual vs. extended events, on-going activities vs. achievements, permanent vs. temporally restricted states, masses vs. individual objects. concrete vs. abstract activities/objects one must wonder why there are just two major lexical classes rather than, say, eight or ten. Moreover, a closer inspection of the vocabulary of a language shows that some items seem to be-wrongly classified: while verbs such as *resemble, exist, be above* or *be tall* do not denote events.

Depending on the construction and on the verb, the verb may either play an important part in the elaboration of the semantics of the proposition or may simply express the means, the manner, the circumstances or the result of the action, while the construction describes the 'central' meaning. In fact, the meanings of verbs and of constructions often interact in very subtle ways. One might conclude then that, there is no longer a clear separation between lexical rules and syntactic rules[4].

The difficulty is then to identify and describe the syntactically relevant aspects of verb.

Some authors treat link-verb as altogether bereft of all lexical meaning. If it were so, there would be no difference between *He is old, He seems old, He becomes old*, since *is, seems, becomes* convey the same grammatical meanings. The combinability of link-verbs is different from that of notional verbs.

a) It is for the most part bilateral since a link verb usually connects two words. In this respect Iq-somewhat resembles the combinability of prepositions and conjunction:

*Eg. I want **hint to be** honest.*

b) Link-verb form combinations with words and word-groups which are but seldom attached to notional verbs.

Verb often grammarians speak only of finite link-verbs used as parts of predicates forgetting about the corresponding verbids which occur in other functions and prove that link -verbs are not just a syntactical class of verbs.

*John being late, **we had to put off the trip.***

His dream of becoming a pilot.

In English an ever greater number of notional verbs are used with a linking function. So that they may be called notional links[5].

E.g. The sun rose red.

He lay asleep

Modal verbs are characterized:

1) By the peculiar modal meanings. The meaning of “action, process” common to all verb is scarcely felt, being suppressed by the meanings of “ability, necessity, permission” to perform an action denoted by some other verb.

2) By their peculiar combinability. It is bilateral like that of link-verbs, but unlike link-verbs which can attach words of different classes, modal verbs can be followed by infinitives only.

You must stay here. He ought to have come. I have to be moving.

3) By their syntactical function. Having no verbids, they are used only as predicates.

Semantic factors continue in playing a contextual role when the particular meanings of items are in focus.

Within the class of verbs, various kinds of semantic sub classification come into mind: verbs with animate or inanimate arguments, verbs of movement, position or placement, verbs of manipulation, experience, perception, communication, and so on. Nearly none of these possible semantic factors is decisive for the further grammatical subclassification of verbs, except animacy in some languages.

The most robust subclassification of verbs concerns the number of arguments: intransitive verbs have one, transitive verbs have two, and ditransitive verbs have three nominal arguments. (Verbs with zero valency are extremely rare - one possible semantic class of this kind are weather verbs, such as Latin *pluit* “it rains”, however, note that English uses here an expletive pronoun, which masks the verb to be intransitive.) Besides that, verbs are subclassified of whether they take a clausal complement (verbs of mental attitudes), which under some conditions can also be reduced to an infinitive or a similar non-finite verb form {*he hopes to win* vs. *he hopes that he will win*}[6]. Furthermore, at least some languages have a subclass of verbs that take a locational argument, e.g., a prepositional phrase (*he sits on the bank, he puts the cans on the bank*). Sometimes one also finds a class of verbs that take prepositional objects (in which the preposition is lexically fixed (without contributing a particular meaning): *an jdn denken* “think at someone”, *auf etw. hoffen* “hope for sth.”, *an etw. glauben* “believe in sth.”.

If two nominal arguments occur with a verb, the meaning of the verb sometimes requires one argument to be animate and the other to be inanimate (*read, sew, enter*), however, more than often this is not the case. The second argument of *see*, for instance, can be inanimate or animate; in the latter case, the two arguments can in principle be exchanged, thereby shifting the intended reading (*the man saw the lion* and *the lion saw the man*

mean different things). It is even possible that a verb has three arguments that are similar in their nature, consider *send* or *introduce* where any ordering of the three nominal arguments is possible *{the neighbor sent/introduced the woman to a specialist: a specialist sent/ introduced the neighbor to the woman; etc.}*.

Verb semantic classes are then constructed from verbs, modulo exceptions, which undergo a certain number of alternations. From this classification, a set of verb semantic classes is organized. We have, for example, the classes of verbs of putting, which include Put verbs, Funnel Verbs, Verbs of putting in a specified direction. Pour verbs, Coil verbs, etc. Other sets of classes include Verbs of removing. Verbs of Carrying and Sending, Verbs of Throwing, Hold and Keep verbs. Verbs of contact by impact, Image creation verbs. Verbs of creation and transformation, Verbs with predicative complements, Verbs of perception, Verbs of desire. Verbs of communication, Verbs of social interaction, etc. As can be noticed, these classes only partially overlap with the classification adopted in WordNet. This is not surprising since the classification criteria are very different[7].

Let us now look in more depth at a few classes and somewhat evaluate the use of such classes for natural language applications (note that several research projects make an intensive use of B. Levin's classes). Note that, w.r.t. WordNet, the classes obtained via alternations are much less hierarchically structured, which shows that the two approaches are really orthogonal.

There are other aspects which may weaken the practical use of this approach, in spite of its obvious high linguistic interest, from both theoretical and practical viewpoints. The first point is that the semantic definition of some classes is somewhat fuzzy and does not really summarize the semantics of the verbs it contains. An alternative would be to characterize a class by a set of features, shared to various extents by the verbs it is composed of. Next, w.r.t. the semantic characterization of the class, there are some verbs which seem to be really outside the class. Also, as illustrated below, a set of classes (such as movement verbs) does not include all the "natural" classes one may expect (but 'completeness' or exhaustiveness has never been claimed to be one of the objectives of this research). This may explain the unexpected presence of some verbs in a class. Finally, distinctions between classes are sometimes hard to make, and this is reinforced by the fact that classes may unexpectedly have several verbs in common.

References:

1. Бархударов Л.С., Штелинг Д.А. Грамматика английского языка. М., 1965, 320 с

2. Бархударов Л.С. Структура простого предложение современного английского языка. М., 1966, 300 с
3. Воронцова Г.И. Очерки по грамматике английского языка. М., 1960, 280 с
4. Иванова И.П. Вид и время в современном английском языке. М., 1961, 290 с
5. Смирницкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка. М., 1966, 300 с
6. Смирницкий А.И. Морфология английского языка. М., 1955, 320 с
7. Allen P.L. The verb system of present day American English. N-Y., 1966, 310 p
8. Bryant M. Current American Usage. N-Y., 1978, 240 p
9. Curme G.O. Grammar of English languages. New York., 1935, 270 p
10. Fries Ch. The structure of English. London., 1951, 180 p

Alisher Shamsiev, Applicant of the Academy of the Prosecutor General of
the Republic of Uzbekistan

THE NATURE AND DIRECTIONS OF PROSECUTORIAL SUPERVISION OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE LAW BY PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION BODIES

A. Shamsiev

Abstract: The article reveals the essence and features of the prosecutor's supervision over the observance of laws in pre-trial criminal proceedings, considered the forms and features of the oversight of evidence, involvement of a person in a criminal case as a suspect or accused, and at the end of the preliminary investigation.

Keywords: prosecutorial supervision, pre-trial proceedings, compliance with laws, forms and features of prosecutorial supervision, engaging a person to participate in a criminal case as a suspect or accused, the end of the preliminary investigation.

The statement of the problem of building a democratic law-governed state and a strong civil society actualizes the increasing requirements for compliance with the law in the activities of law enforcement agencies. Since the rule of law provides for the protection and protection of the rights and interests of a person, society, and the state from crimes by creating conditions for their disclosure, exposing and convicting the guilty with the establishment of guarantees for the realization of individual rights.

International standards for ensuring human rights and freedoms, enshrined in the World Declaration of Human Rights and the International