
FUNCTIONAL AND SEMANTIC PROPERTIES OF CLASSIFICATIONS OF VERBS IN RUSSIAN LINGUISTICS

Bobur Bakhodirovich Riskiev*

*Teacher,

UzSWLU, UZBEKISTAN

DOI: [10.5958/2249-7315.2021.00238.0](https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7315.2021.00238.0)

ABSTRACT

The article studies the verbs, which include lexemes with the meaning “to speak”. The lexemes of the differential system can belong to one classification of semes. The results of the investigated presented verbs are shown and the categoricity of Russian verbs is significantly based. The verb of speech has the semantics of verbs, structurally meaning “to speak”. The overview of the concept of the content of verbs of speech in the presented article is based on the transformed view of A. Vezhbitskaya's theory with the use of the Natural Semantic Language (NSL). It is known that Vezhbitskaya uses a collection of elementary primitive meanings, which is assumed to be the same for all languages [2]. The presented significant primitives are used when defining the semantics of lexemes, but they themselves are not defined, they are taken significantly by elementary units, or by primary meanings-primitives, in terminology, they are structured by a “complex” semantic base. Most researchers studied the problem of visibility of verbs of speech on the basis of different languages, including Russian (works by Yu.D. Apresian, M.Ya. Glovinskaya, I.M. Kobozeva, E.V. Paducheva, etc.). But in this article, the description of the analysis is based on a theoretical concept that is associated with the work of Vezhbitskaya. When achieving the results of the presented work, not every significant primitive indicated by Vezhbitskaya is used, but only a certain amount. In addition, additional primitives and their classes are used. The main changes that are understood in the NSL are as follows: the primitives “causate” and “norm” are added to the significant primitives used by Vezhbitskaya, in addition, the classification of second-order predicates is introduced. Second-order predicates are predicates, held positions of the concept in correlation with first-order predicates. For example: “X sings well”, “X sings [is] good”.

KEYWORDS: *Desire, factitive verb, causator, individual, full-denominational verb, action, continuum, Anna Vezhbitskaya, natural semantic language, verbs of speech, second-order predicates.*

INTRODUCTION

An important part of the concept Vezhbitskaya (close to the concept of generativism) is the lack of justification in the analysis, which is aimed at identifying the cause of the connection with the class, which includes a large number of verbs. The basis will be a variety of hypothetical-deductive methods of analysis, namely, the identification of a hypothesis about the essence of the studied actant (in this position, the attraction of the willow X to a certain type of verb of speech). The hypothesis, first of all, gives impetus to the investment gate, which have their own evidentiary cases in relation to the predicate, the conclusion of the empirical continuum, etc. Research findings, etc. - the main stage of study, considered by some parts [3]. Namely, a comparative analysis of the visibility of the meanings of verbs of speech is given with the analysis indicated by Vezhbitsky in a certain position.

A total of nine categories of verbs are classified based on from verb “to speak”:

Actually verbs of speech are characterized by the meaning “to speak”, a variety of dorsal expression. Namely, the significant feature of the represented verbs is not defined in relation to other verbs, since the result of this phenomenon is their individuality and paucity.

It should also be noted that the revealed meaning may have oppositional sides in relation to the definition in explanatory dictionaries, since they are classified by a significant basis. This can be done by highlighting values according to their categoricity in a uniform order, namely, renouncing polysemy. For example: speak, say, explain... In total, there are 62 verbs: talk, chatter, mumble, grumble, utter, express, recite, dictate, finish, stutter, sing, express, click, lie, mumble, lie, speak, hint, deceive, mention, discuss, explain, describe, inquire, dissuade, deny, retell, enumerate, tell, confirm, say goodbye, explain, exaggerate, lament, mumble, let it slip, babble, preach, utter [the word], blabber, rant, divulge, talk, explain, order, tell, reason, say / speak, deliberate, report, compose, jabber, repeat, interpret, shake, persuade, mention, beg, agree, whisper, joke. [4]

The system of propositions (of propositional functions) with these verbs is represented by the following type: X inquires about P at Y-a:

- 1) X wants to know_ about P;
- 2) X thinks that Y knows_ about P;
- 3) X wants Wu said to H-y_ about P.

For example:

He (mister Fitzpatrick) hurriedly dismounted from the horse and, entering, inquired from Susana in very abrupt and incoherent expressions ... whether the lady was staying at the hotel [4]. From the above, it can be seen that variables X and Y are used in significant systems, which naturally replace the individual and the actant of the continuum. Both facts are determined by the “animate” function. P is a proposition. In use primitics to know, various semes arise. It is possible to mark and the continuum X knows someone (Y-a) or X knows_ about something (for example, about an incident). On the surface, such a case is not revealed, however, it is hidden by the use of official words used by the preposition about. Provided that a different semantics is expressed thanks to the preposition, it will be about a combination of know_about, namely, to have some data, indicated by an underscore. [5]

Causative verbs are characterized by the meaning of “causality”, which has no surface in understanding. For example: to force, to impose. Shown 9 verbs in this case: instill, forbid, compel, impose, insist, induce, instruct, send [smb. for smth. / smb.], Give orders.

X tells U-u to do Z:

- 1) X wants Y to do Z;
- 2) Because of this, X causes U to do Z;
- 3) Because of this, X says Ooh Q.

For example:

However, I agree that, although parents are acting foolishly, trying to impose their will, they should still be consulted in such cases and, perhaps, even it is necessary to recognize their right of prohibition [4]. It can be seen from the context that two auxiliary facts are used in the definition, which are characteristic of causative verbs. In the Dictionary of Observability of Semantics of the verbs of A. Vezhbitskaya's speech, definitions similar to these verbs are described, which, in turn, indicate this “to speak”. Factual verbs reflect the desired influence offered the individual-causator

is the execution of an action by another individual. For example:

My uncle has the most honest rules

When seriously ill,

He respect forced myself

And I could not think of a better one. [Pushkin]

Only the offend officer vanity forced him to say that, they say, “we'll see how we should act” [Sholokhov M. The Quiet Don]. The steppe conquered him, imperiously forced him to live a primitive, plant life [Sholokhov M. Quiet Don]. It should be noted that the following category of verbs denotes the setting, observed by the detachment among the virtual agent and the wearer of the intent. For example: A mother made her son wash the dishes. The individual of the action is structurally edification, and the individual is the intention, which prompts to be activated as a subject. [6]

In Russian linguistics, the verbs of the desired influence permissive semantics has a small number of categories of verb: allow, forbid, give. In addition, most verbs, non-causative, have in the context the semantics of factitive causation. For example, E.Ya. Gordon notes the example of a given verb in Russian linguistics: He told him to get out (He told him to get out). In Russian linguistics, identifying the full-symbolic verbs of permissive semantics are less common. The verbs that express permissive causation in Russian linguistics are the verbs of the desired influence. For example: We will not allow people to offend us! We will not allow you to be searched. Don't let people talk. In Russian linguistics permissive semantics allow to go out directs to let go of the verb (Mother let her daughter go out into the street). [7]

However, the meanings allow to offend, allow to search, etc. in Russian linguistics, it is not revealed by a single action in differentiation, for example, with Buryat linguistics, in which there is the possibility of revealing the permissive semantics of the full-valued verb in a single word: eduulkhe - to allow to eat. It is important to note about the nature of the causative pussy verb as an object-oriented pussy verb. [8] The causative verbs have a greater directional variety, which testifies to the distinctive parts of the current category of verbs of the category of transition [drop the book, lay the children, etc.] Based on what was said earlier, the value of causation comes from the identification of causative-investment relations among the parts of objective being. The value of the causative verb, noting the causative-investment relationship, reveals the action of the individual on the actant, due to which the actant is transformed into a different position, property, or performs a symmetrical action (melt, wet, green, send, etc.). In this connection, the significant basis of the causative verb consists of the meaning of the causis. [9] The semantics of the said category of verbs reflects the causis of the emery of a certain essence, continuum, property. For example: to melt - “cause something to melt”; surprise - “cause someone to be surprised,” and so on. In semantics causative verbs (with the exception of the verbs of the desired influence) there is a direction to the action and the continuum, which is the result of the influence. So, in a significant system of causal verbs, there is a “seme of a state, a feature attributed to the object of action,” namely investigate, which is structurally repulsive to the meaning of causis. So “causative verbs denote actions-states, actions-events, actions-qualities, actions - local relations, etc.” [10]

This case, aimed at the created share or investment gate, refers to non-causative differentiators. In Russian linguistics, the correlation of verbs by causality / causality is included in the necessary part of the causative verb, because non-causative differentiators are semantically investigated (with the exception of the verbs of the desired stock). Another possibility is differentiated by the meaning of causation – the expression of causative-investigate connections in linguistics. Causation connects two functionally significant areas of verbal classification: the areas of action and continuum. [11] Causation is the connection between the verb of the action and the

continuum: it is noteworthy that the result of an individual's action is the continuum of the causable object. The causative pussy verb is significant in the cause, and the non-causative verb is significant in the investment. For example: Janitor burned (causative verb of the action) last year's leaves - Leaves burned (non-causative verb of the continuum). Therefore, any causative verb needs to be studied only in a dyadic position – a causative verb / non-causative verb. In the absence of such a provision, the verb is not studied as a causative one. Wed: to amuse - to have fun send – go remind – remember put to sleep - to sleep etc. [12]

REFERENCES:

1. Kildibekova TA. Action verbs in modern Russian. – Saratov, 1985. 160 p.
2. Vezhbetskaya A. Semantic universals and description of languages. Bulygina T.V. (ed.). Shmelev A.D. (trans.). M.: Languages of Russian culture, 1999.780 p.
3. Voishvillo E.K., Degtyarev M.G. Logics. M.: Vlados-Press, 2001. P. 449.
4. Fielding G. The Story of Tom Jones, Foundling. M: Eksmo, 2008. 896 p.
5. Wendler Z. “Illocutionary suicide.” New in foreign linguistics. Issue 16: Linguistic Pragmatics. M.: Progress, 1985. P. 238-250.
6. Ermolaeva IA. Semantic Classification of Galgols of Speech in Russian. XLIV International Philological Conference. (Russia, St. Petersburg, March 10-15, 2015). Abstracts of reports. Filol. Fac. SPbGU, 2015. P. 98-100
7. Abaev VI. History of language and history of people. Questions of theory and history of language. M., 1952. P. 40-55
8. Abdulragimova EG. Construction with transitive verbs in multi-system languages. AKD. Baku, 1981.
9. Abrazheev AI, Danilov PA, Bigaev RI. Essays on the comparative grammar of the Russian and Uzbek languages: A textbook for the correspondence department of the faculty of Russian language and literature of pedagogical universities of Uzbekistan. R.I. Jumaniyazov, R.I. Bigaev. Tashkent, 1960.189 p.
10. Rasuljanovna, IN. The phenomenon of lacunarity as the linguacultural issue. Prospects of world science-2019, 2019;226.
11. Azizov AA. Comparative grammar of Russian and Uzbek languages. Morphology. 2nd ed., Rev. and add. Tashkent: Ukituvchi, 1983. 238 p.
12. Alimova MKh. Grammatical causative in Uzbek, Tajik and English. Comparative typological analysis. ACD. M., 1980.