# Occurrence of English Verb Predicates in the Functional-Semantic Field

**Davlatova Mukhayyo Hasanovna**

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) associate professor in philological sciences

Head of the Department of English at the Bukhara State Medical Institute

**Abstract**

The article is devoted to the study of theories and examples in which the meaning and argument relations of the verb are fully reflected in the compositional analysis of the functional-semantic field of English verb predicates. Accordingly, the verb is the semantic beginning of the sentence, the element that determines the basic semantic structure of the sentence. The central meaning of the ditranzitive construction is related to the meaning of the successful transfer of an object to the recipient, and the referent of the subject causes this transfer to be influenced by agens. The recognition of subtle semantic discrepancies between coherent syntactic (lower categorical) frameworks is also focused on the existence of a strong correlation between the meanings of verbs and the syntactic frames in which they can occur.

**Keywords**: verb predicates, lexical, functional, semantic field, compositionality, argument, agens.

**Introduction.** A number of theories similar to compositionalism have been put forward. In particular, in recent fusion-based grammars such as LFG-Lexical Functional Grammar, GPSG-Generalized phrase structure grammar and HPSG- Head-driven phrase structure grammar (Schiber 1986) have implemented, they assume that the semantic features of the argument are studied at the phraseological level. It can be observed that this approach to the principle of composition is insufficient. It is known that these mentioned theories do not have specific principles regarding the compositionality under consideration. The fact is that the requirements for the construction concept must be different from the requirements for the predicate concept. Also, the formation of definite and indefinite ratios of predicate forms and their meanings, arguments and predicate dependencies are also taken into account.

Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1992), Marantzlar (1992) have pointed out that the method of compositionality is only related to non-ergative verbs. At the same time, they noted that the verbs of movement, which mean the direction, are accusative. (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1992).

**The main part.** There is a discrepancy between the lexical semantics of verbs and the meaning of lexical units in the form of syntactic frames. All verbs involved in this construction should be considered as directional action verbs, as they indicate movement along a certain defined direction. It follows that such verbs are both non-ergative (because they come in the form of construction) and accusative (because they are verbs of directional action). Alternatively, the means expressed in this construction are lexical - takes a meaning depending on the semantics of the participating verbs without obeying the semantic rule. It can be assumed that only non-ergative verbs cannot form constructions. But it seems that it is necessary to pay attention to the type of restriction related to the semantics of the verb, but also to the fact that the verb is accepted in a certain way. This raises the question of whether it occurs in a syntactic form. In the

general plan, if the verb corresponds to the result of a certain lexical expression, it is activated as a predicate. (Pinker 1989). Rather, given the more complex constraint required, it is important to determine whether the directional construct can participate in the argument structure. Recognizing the existence of constructions with a certain context, we can recognize compositionality as a special device: The meaning of the construction is the result of the integration of the meanings of the lexical units into the meanings of the construction. Thus, we think that the syntax and semantics of the sentence should be considered based on the features of the main verb. If the potential range of verb classes that can be associated with a construction can be delimited a priori, it can be argued that constructions play a more important role in the acquisition of verbal semantics. In fact, there seem to be several ways to connect the verb meaning and the constructive meaning. It is known that it is possible to determine the constructive properties of a group of verbs. Because the meaning of the verb can be connected with the meaning of the construction in a small number of cases. It is assumed that several methods can be used. Importantly, the meaning of the verb need not directly reflect the meaning associated with the construction.

Constructions are usually associated with a family of closely related meanings rather than a single, abstract meaning. Given that no strict separation between syntax and vocabulary is expected, this creates polysemy. Because it is recognized by many scientists that studying the linguistic principles of morphological polysemy is the norm. (Wittgenstein 1953; Austin 1940; Bolinger 1968; Rosch J973; Rosch et al. 1976; Fillmore 1976, 1982; Lakoff 1977, 1987; Hyman 1978; Brugman 1981; Lindner 1981; Switzer 1990; Emanatian 1990). These authors treat constructions as the same basic data type as morphemes, and argue that they have as many levels of value as morphemes. There is a need to discuss a specific example of such a constructive ambiguity.

Ditransitive expressions in English usually mean that the argument of the agent causes the object to be transferred to the recipient. As noted below, this actual successful transfer case is considered a key feature of the construct.

At the same time, it is generally accepted that many ditransitive expressions enter into a potential relationship with the verb argument, although it is characteristic of fixed units. For example, a phrase called "friendship" such as Chris baked a cake to Jan does not mean that Ian actually took the cake. Maybe the cake was stolen by thieves while Chris was on his way to Ian's. In general, expressions involving verbs of creation (e.g., cook, make, build,) and verbs of reception (e.g., receive, catch, win, win) refer to the fact that the agent actually receives the object from the potential recipient. does not necessarily mean that it is the cause. The information delivered should be more related to the result. "Chris baked a pie for Ian" means that Chris baked the pie with the intention of giving it to Ian. In fact, it can be seen that many verb classes related to the construction give slightly different interpretations.

For example: verb phrases with a pragmatic content indicating that the Representative undertakes the obligation (promise, guarantee, obligation) do not mean that these aspects are clearly conveyed. For example, the fact that Bill promised his son a car does not mean that Bill actually gave his son a car, or even that Bill intended to give his son a car. Rather, transference is represented by the "conditions of satisfaction" associated with the action specified by the predicate (Searle 1983). A fulfilled promise, for example, "promise" means that you get everything that is promised.

Phrases that contain future possessive verbs (eg, bequeath, leave, send, transfer, allot, allot, assign) indicate that the agent will change the referent of the first object to the reference of the second object at some point in the future. means that it acts to cause its signifier to accept. This class differs from the last two classes in that no purpose or obligation of future action is implied by the referent of the subject; the role of the agent in transfer is performed by the action indicated by the predicate.

Phrases with permissive verbs (eg allow, allow) mean that the agent permits the transfer without preventing it, not that the agent actually causes the transfer. For example, Joe let Billy have a Popsicle means that Joe allowed Billy to eat a Popsicle or didn't prevent him from having a Popsicle, not that Joe forced Billy to eat a Popsicle.

Phrases related to denial verbs (eg refuse, refused) express the denial of transfer, for example, Joe refused to give Bob a lift and his mother refused to give Billie a birthday cake. Here the transfer is relevant in the sense that an opportunity has arisen for a successful transfer, but the agent is understood to have refused to act as a reason for this.

Due to these differences, constructional semantics can be noted as a phenomenon that illuminates the scope of meaning. That is, the ditransitive form is associated with a set of systematically connected meanings. Thus, ditransitive can be considered as a case of constructive polysemy: the same form is combined with different but related meanings. Considering these differences in terms of constructive polysemy, for example, as opposed to postulating a set of lexical rules, we can naturally capture the relationship between different meanings. In particular, the polysemantic analysis allows to recognize the central meaning of constructions in a separate state.

It can be said that the central meaning of the ditransitive construction is related to the meaning of the successful transfer of the object to the addressee, and the referent of the subject causes this transfer under the influence of the agent. There are several reasons for taking this view. The central meaning suggested here involves concrete rather than metaphorical or abstract (here: potential) transference, and concrete meanings are diachronic (Traugott 1988; Sweetser 1990) and synchronic (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). shown to be primary in values. In addition, most of the metaphorical constructions are based on this rule.

For example: Consider (8) and (9):

(8) Mary taught Bill French.

(9) Mary taught French to Bill. (8) means that Bill learned French, the metaphorical transfer was successful. This differs from (9), where no such inference is required. Similarly, compare (10) and (11):

(10) Mary showed her mother the photograph.

(11) Mary showed the photograph to her mother (but her nearsighted mother could not see it).

(11) Mary showed a photo of her mother (but her mother could not see it).

(10) implies that the mother actually saw the photograph, whereas (11) is not given this meaning in most cases in formal speech. If we really accept the successful transmission of information as the central meaning of the construction, it becomes possible to explain these arguments. can be done. It is necessary to focus on these central meaning units as the starting point of constructions. Finally, the central meaning in a successful transformation is seen in the construct. Because other classes of meaning can be economically expressed as derivatives of this meaning.

At the same time, it is noticeable that the various meanings of linguistic structures cannot be predicted and must be conditionally related to the construction. For example, it is not predictable that verbs of creation in English are primarily ditransitive constructions; In addition, ditransitive expressions with verbs of creation imply a target transformation. Therefore, different possible opinions can be put forward. Here, the meanings belonging to separate classes of verbs are taken into account in order to provide the specific central meaning of the construction. As a result, adaptation of the meaning of the verb to the agent allows to complete the semantics of the verbs. This meaning is determined by the lexical meaning of the verb. This approach makes it possible to classify similar forms in terms of meaning and structure.

The main part of the semantics of frames related to the verb includes the tasks of the participants of the context. The role of the participant in the context is different from the roles related to the construction. Because, in the constructions, the function of the argument is taken into account.

The distinction is made to understand that verbs are related to frame-specific tasks, while constructions are related to general tasks such as agent, goal. To determine the main meaning of the verb, it is useful to pay attention to the following frame gerund form of the verb "occur".

No_ _ ing happened.

The number and type of participant tasks directly understood in the interpretation of this phrase corresponds to the number and type of participant tasks in the frame semantics associated with the verb. For example:

(26)

a. No kicking occurred. (two-participant interpretation

b. He sneezing occurred. (one-participant interpretation).

c. No rumbling occurred. (one-participant [sound emission] interpretation) . There was no noise. (interpretation of one participant [sound emission])

d. No hammering occurred. (one-participant [sound emission] or two-participant [impact] interpretation) There is no impact. (one-way [sound emission] or two-way [impact] interpretation).

e. No painting occurred. (two-participant interpretation-either creation or coloring interpretation) Coloring was not done. (double interpretation – or coloring interpretation

f. No giving occurred (three-participant interpretation) In some cases, the verb is not used in this frame unless it is accompanied by a specific object complement.

a. No putting occurred. No putting of cakes into the oven occurred. (27) a. It did not pour. The cookies were not put in the oven.

b. No devouring occurred. No devouring of cupcakes occurred. Eating did not happen. The cupcakes were not eaten. In such cases, imperative objects are used to match the participants associated with the verb. In some cases, the verb is not used in this frame unless it is accompanied by specific objects: Note that some of the examples above have multiple interpretations, indicating more than one meaning of the same verb. Within this polysemy, missing elements are usually associated not with a single abstract meaning, but with a set of related meanings (Austin 1940; Wittgenstein 1953; Bolinger 1968; Roche 1973; Roche et al. 1976; Fillmore 1976; 1982; 1919). Lakoff). 1977, 1987; Hyman 1978; Brugman 1981, 1988; Lindner 1981; Sweetser 1990). Therefore, the presence of two, three or more unrelated but connected meanings of the verb is observed. These multiple meanings can be clearly linked by referring to the frame semantics associated with each of them. However, the new meaning for each new syntactic configuration is not subject to an unlimited level of analysis.

**Summary.** According to the constructive approach to the structure of arguments, the semantics of verb classes and the semantics of constructions are combined. In this case, if you give the semantics of specific expressions, it raises the question of which series of verb classes can be associated with a given construction. Any verb class usually means lum can be conditionally associated with a construction. For example, if we accept that the ditransitive construction is directly related to certain semantics, for example, "X CA USES Y to RECElvr Z", it is not possible in principle for mood verbs such as *sadden, rectiger, anger*. When these verbs are used in the ditransitive construction, they indicate the resulting emotional state. Joe angered Bob the pink slip. ("Joe gave Bob a pink slip, causing Bob to become angry.")

*Obviously we want to rule out such a possibility. Joe hurt Bob, joke. (Joe gave Bob a layoff notice, which angered Bob).*

In order to describe the possible types of verb classes that can be associated with certain constructions, we need to consider in detail the types of relations that verb semantics can have with construction semantics. The event type represented by l is an example of a more general event type represented by the construction. For example, *She handed him the ball*. Hand "hand"

lexically indicates a type of transfer event. At the same time, transfer also creates semantics related to ditransitive construction. For example: While causative action is semantics related to transfer ditransitive construction. She put the phone on the table. Lexically, put means the event type of the causal action, and the causal action is definitely the semantics related to the formation of the causal action.

## REFERENCES

1. Brosig B. Depictives and resultatives in modern khalkh Mongolian // Hokkaidō

2. Gengo bunka kenkyū.2009. No. 7.–P. 71–101.

3. Bybee J. L., R. Perkins, W. Pagliuca.Theevolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages ofthe world. –Chicago: The U. of Chicago Press, 1994. Carrier J., RandallJ.H., The Argument Structure and Syntactic Structure of Resultatives //Linguistic Inquiry 23, 1992. –P. 173-234.

4. Goldberg A.Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure. L. – Chicago: The University of ChicagoPress, 1995. –265 p.Davlatova, M. H. Relation of lexical-semantic structure of verbs in the linguistic essence. IEJRD-International Multidisciplinary Journal, 6(5).

5. Ризаев Б. Х. К проблеме лимитативно нейтральных глаголов современного немецкого языка. // Лингвистические исследования: Аспекты грамматического анализа. – М., 1990. – С. 131-140.

6. Сайфуллаева Р. Р., Менглиев Б.Р., Боқиева Г.Ҳ., Қурбонова М.М., Юнусова З. Ҳ., Абузалова М. Қ. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. – Т.: Фан ва технология, 2010. – 404 б.

7. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. – Т.: «Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси», 2008. – 286 б.

8. Сафаров Ш. Семантика. – Т.: «Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси», 2013. – 341 б.

9. Сичинава Д. В. Связь между формой и семантикой перфекта: одна неизученная закономерность // А. В. Бондарко и др. (ред.). Динамические модели: Слово. Предложение. Текст. Сб. статей в честь Е. В. Падучевой. М.: Языки славянских культур, 2008. –С. 711–749.

10. Сулейманова Н. Ж., Локатив категориясининг синтактик семантик ва дейктик хусусиятлари. Филол.бўйич фалсафа фан.док.дисс.автореферати. Т., 2018. 21б.

11. Hasanovna, D. M. (2019). VARIABILITY OF ASPECTUAL MEANINGS IN ENGLISH. European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences Vol, 7(12).

12. Davlatova, M. H. (2020). An Integrative history of Aspectual meanings. JournalNX, 6(04), 17-22.

13. Davlatova, M. H. (2020). Aspectual variability of information culture in the history of the English language. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, *3*(3), 24-28.

14. Davlatova, M. H. (2020). Lexico-semantic Structure and Its Analysis on the Example of Verbs. *JournalNX*, *6*(06), 189-192.

15. Davlatova, M. H. (2021). Relation of lexical-semantic structure of verbs in the linguistic essence. *IEJRD-International Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(5).

16. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Semantic Implementation of resultutive structures. *JournalNX*, *7*(06), 291-294.

17. Давлатова, М. Х. (2017). Этапы работы с видеотекстами на занятиях Английского языка. *Интернаука*, (9-2), 16-19.

18. Давлатова, М. Х. (2015). The role of songs in learning English. *Молодой ученый*, (10), 1145-1147.

19. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Different aspects of resultative structures according to their linguistic essence. Academicia Globe, 2(05), 475-479.

20. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Linguistic and cognitive features of performing effective actions. World Bulletin of Social Sciences, 3(10), 41-44.

21. Давлатова, М. (2020). Aspectual and lexico-semantic classification of verbs. Сўз санъати халқаро журнали, 1, 2020.

22. Давлатова, М. Х. (2018). Работа над видеотекстом на занятиях английского языка. Теория и практика современной науки, (4), 242-246.

23. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). On the interrelationship of resultive and causative meanings. World Bulletin of Public Health, 9, 212-215.

24. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Resultative and causative meanings in English and Uzbek languages. TA'LIM VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI, 297-302.

25. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Aspectual and lexical-semantic classification of verbs. Open Access Repository, 8(2), 116-121.

26. Hasanovna, M. D. (2022). Typology of expressive emotional and linguistic features. International journal of literature and languages, 2(11), 65-69.

27. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Different aspects of resultative structures according to their linguistic essence. Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research, 2 (05), 475–479. VOLUME03 ISSUE06 PAGES, 39, 47.

28. Davlatova, M. K. (2021). The process of transformation of philosophy understanding as factor of information culture of the period of the English renaissance (XVI c.). Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 1(5), 949-957.

29. Davlatova, M. X. (2018). The easy way of learning English with the help of songs. Теория и практика современной науки, (4 (34)), 578-581.

30. Давлатова, М. Х. (2021). The Expression of resultative and depictive constructions in english and uzbek languages. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 4(5).

31. Shadmanov, K. B., Davlatova, M. H., Ostonova, S. N., & Radjabova, A. T. (2020). ENGLISH RENAISSANCE: TRANSFORMATION OF 61 PHILOSOPHY UNDERSTANDING AS A FACTOR OF INFORMATION CULTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EPOCH. Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science, 5(1), 61-67.

32. Muhayyo, D. (2017). THE ROTOR CONSTRUCTION OF COTTON RAW IN APPEARING VERTICAL BOUNDARY. Интернаука, (9-2), 76-78.

33. Давлатова, М. (2020). FE'LLARNING ASPEKTIK VA LEKSIK-SEMANTIK TASNIFI. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 3(1).

34. Давлатова, М. Ҳ. (2021). РЕЗУЛЬТАТИВЛИКНИНГ АСПЕКТУАЛ ТАДҚИҚОТЛАР ДОИРАСИДА ЎРГАНИЛИШИ. Scientific progress, 2(2), 1678-1683.

35. Давлатова, М. Х. (2013). Хорошее поведение-важный способ формирования личности. Вестник Таджикского национального университета, (3-6), 237-241.

36. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Resultative and Causative Meanings in English and Uzbek Languages. American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research, 3(9), 192–196. Retrieved from https://global research network.us/index.php/ajshr/article/view/1509

37. Davlatova, M. H. (2021). Semantic implementation of resultutive structures. JournalNX-A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, 6, 291-294.

38. Shirinova, N. D., & Davlatova, M. K. MORPHOLOGICAL WAY OF DIFFERENTIATION OF SUBSTANCE AND ATTRIBUTIVE MEANINGS IN THE LANGUAGE

SYSTEM. ILMIY XABARNOMA. НАУЧНЫЙ ВЕСТНИК Учредители: Андижанский государственный университет им. ЗМ Бабура,(1), 86-89.

39. Davlatova, M. X. (2015). The role of Songs in learning English. Journal. MolodoyUchyonniy, 10, 90.

40. Ширинова, Н. Д., & Давлатова, М. X. МОРФОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ СПОСОБ РАЗГРАНИЧЕНИЯ ЗНАЧЕНИЙ ПРЕДМЕТНОСТИ И КАЧЕСТВЕННОСТИ В СИСТЕМЕ ЯЗЫКА. Muassis: Buxoro davlat universiteti TAHRIRIYAT: Muharrirlar: MQ Abuzalova MA Bokareva NN Voxidova, 40.

41. Hasanovna, D. M. (2023). ON THE TYPES OF RESULTS STRUCTURES EXPRESSED BY A SECONDARY PREDICAT. International Journal Of Literature And Languages, 3(03), 52-58.

42. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Semantic Implementation of resultutive structures. novateur publications JournalNX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal.

43. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Semantic Implementation of resultutive structures. novateur publications JournalNX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal.

44. Muhayyo Davlatova. Semantic properties of effective constructions in English and Uzbek languages. E3S Web Conf. Volume 420, 2023 EBWFF 2023 - International Scientific Conference Ecological and Biological Well-Being of Flora and Fauna (Part 1).

45. Davlatova, M. H. RELATION OF LEXICAL-SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF VERBS TO RESULTABILITY.

46. Davlatova Mukhayyo Khasanovna. (2023). THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF PREDICATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS (In the example of the English language). Academia Repository, 4(10), 225–232. Retrieved from https://academiarepo.org/index.php/1/article/view/63