TYPOLOGY OF ZERO PROCEDURAL SYNTAXEME IN THE PREDICATE POSITION (NP2)

Nodira Sanakulovna Artikova
Samarkand state institute of foreign languages
Teacher of the department of English philology

The term "procedural" means that it is associated with the designation of a process opposed to substance and qualification. The term "process" is a more accurate name for the concept denoted by a verb than the word "action", since the latter is also used to name what is denoted by a verb noun. Procedural syntaxems may have non-categorical signs of activity and stativeness, the differentiation of which presents a number of difficulties.

The lexical base of procedural syntaxes in the NP2 position is verbs of various semantics. "A verb is usually considered to be that part of speech which, by its semantics, expresses an action or state, and by its form conveys a person, time, voice, type, mood" [1]. Some grammarians, in particular A.Khozhiev, believe that gdagol expresses action, state, mental state and biological process [2]. L.S.Barkhudarov and D.A.Shteling propose to distinguish verbs expressing states from verbs expressing actions depending on their transitivity and intransitivity [3]. F.Miller determines the stativeness of verbs in English sentences by the following criteria:

1) stative verbs, like most adjectives, are not used in an imperative sentence;

2) stative verbs are not used in a progressive form;

3) stative verbs are not used with some types of "mode adverbs" [4].

A number of verbs can convey a sign of activity or stativeness, depending on the context, namely on compatibility with other elements in the sentence. So, M.Leach gives two sentences with the verb "remember", in one of which a sign of activity is realized, and in the other – a sign of stativeness:

1. Suddenly, I remembered a letter.

2. I shall remember that until I die [5].

These proposals suggest that the procedural active and stative syntaxems differ in distributive properties and compatibility.

The differentiation of the procedural stative syntaxeme from the procedural active one is not the immediate task of our study. This problem requires special attention. We will confine ourselves only to identifying signs of activity and stativeness in relation to explicitly unexpressed (zero) procedural syntaxes in the NP2 position.

The factual material indicates that procedural syntaxems in the NP2 position will prevail over such non-categorical features as activity, negativity, modality, stativeness, etc., which will be discussed below.

The sign of activity (from Lat. actio "action") is associated with the designation of the action. The zero procedural active syntaxeme in the structure of the following incomplete sentences is allocated in the NP2 position.1. Who told you?   1. Навоий. Ким айтди?

June (GWM, 88) ⟶ Жалолиддин. Мажиддин (УН, 365)

June <u>told</u> me.   ⟶   Мажиддин <u>айтди.</u>

2. Who told you to steal?   2. Мавлон. Қанча одам келибди?

She (DSC, 197)   ⟶   Салтанат. Кӯпчилик (АК, 161)

She <u>told</u> me to steal. ⟶   Кӯпчилик <u>келибди.</u>

3. What brings you here?   3. – Нега бундай сӯраяпсиз?

Good nature (DS, 205)   – Ӯзим (СМБ, 110)

Good nature <u>brings</u> me here.⟶   Ӯзим <u>сӯраяпман.</u>

In sentences (1-3), the syntaxeme expressed by the verb forms "tell, brings"; "айтди, келибди, сураяпти" is endowed with signs of procedural and activity. The

presence of a sign of activity is proved by the fact that, on the basis of a nuclear predicative connection, the investigated syntaxeme is combined with an agentive (producer of action) syntaxeme. This syntaxeme in the structure of incomplete sentences in response replicas is implemented on the basis of transitive and intransitive verbs in the personal form of a valid voice, which denote actions performed by the subject. Therefore, the elements "June; Majiddin; she; кўпчилик; nature; ўзим" in the position of the subject (nuclear predicated component – NP1) are defined as means of expression of the agentive syntaxeme. The procedural active syntaxeme in English can be explicated by:

a) transitive and intransitive, marginal and non-marginal verbs in personal form:

4. Who goes to the attack?

Bersaglieri (EHFA, 35)⟶   Bersaglieri<u>goes</u> to the attack.

5. What ever made you to come here?

   My sins (GFS, 19)⟶   My sins <u>made </u>me to come here.

b) analytical forms of the verb, partially expressed predicate:

6. You haven`t made any promise?

   Yes, I have (ShP, 48)⟶   Yes, I <u>have made</u> some promise.

7. Are you going up by train this morning?

   Yes, I am (OBS, 160)⟶   … I <u>am going up</u> by train … .

8. You ought to come out.

   I will (EHFA, 126)⟶   I <u>will come</u> out.

c) a combination of a verb-bundle with a prepositional group:

9. Who was in command?

   Dave Nelson (CFS, 328)⟶   Dave Nelson <u>was in command.</u>

10. Who was in charge here?

   Miss Van Campen (EHFA, 62) ⟶ Miss Van Campen <u>was in charge</u> here.

In sentences (9-10), the procedural active syntaxeme is determined by the transformation of verbalization:

(9) Dave Nelson was in command ⟶ Dave Nelson commanded (cr.: be in command of regiment ⟶ to command regiment) (BARS)

(10) Miss Van Campen was in charge ⟶ Miss Van Campen charged.

In the Uzbek language, the procedural active syntaxeme can be explicated by:

a) transitive and intransitive, marginal and non-marginal verbs in personal form:

11. – Ким айтди?

– Мутавали (АХК, 121) ⟶ Мутавали <u>айтди</u>.

12. Ақиқа. Бургут ҳам нафсидан илинар эмиш.

Асилзода Саидхон. Ҳисор қўзичоғи оёғидан (САЮ, 143) ⟶ Ҳисор қўзичоғи оёғидан <u>илинади</u>.

b) a combination of the adverbial participle with service verbs or analytical forms:

13. – Буларни ким олиб келди?

– Аканг қарағай (ШЮ, 1965, N11, 46) ⟶ Аканг қарағай олиб келди.

14. Ҳалигини шу уйнинг бир боласи миниб кетди.

– Қанақа бола?

– Ўн етти, ўн тўққиз яшар йигит (СМБ, 82) ⟶ ... ўн тўққиз яшар йигит отни <u>миниб кетди.</u>

15. – Ким уни ютиб чиқади?

– Италянлар (ЭХАК, 313) ⟶ Италянлар <u>ютиб чиқади</u>.

c) participle + person ending or participle and verb copula:

16. – Меҳмонлар келганмиди?

– Ёр-биродарлар (ШЮ, 1964, 9, 57) ⟶ Ёр-биродарлар <u>келганди.</u>

17. Арслон. Мадазимни ким отган?

Марков. Султонбек (КЯ, 149) ⟶ Султонбек Мадазимни <u>отган эди.</u>

On the basis of the nuclear predicative connection , the zero procedural active syntaxeme of the English and Uzbek languages can be combined

a) with an agentive syntaxeme:

18. Who gave you that?   18. Сени бу ерга ким олиб келди?

Soams (GFS, 66) ⟶ Мутавали (АХК, 121)

Soamsgave me that. ⟶ Мутавали олиб келди.

b) with an agentive negative syntaxeme, which are expressed by a negative pronoun, in this case, the procedural active syntaxeme in the Uzbek language has a sign of negativity;

19. What`s ailing you?   19. Нима бўлди, Кетрин?

   Nothing (GFS, 179) ⟶   Ҳеч нима (ЭХАК, 210)

Nothing is ailing me. ⟶   Ҳеч нима бўлмади.

In the Uzbek language, an explicating procedural active syntaxeme in the position of a nuclear predictive component based on a nuclear predicative connection can be combined with a qualificative-quantitative syntaxeme, which is not found in English:

20. Қанча пулинг қолди?

    Саксон етти сўм (Г. Г., 72) ⟶   Саксон етти сўм колди.

In common incomplete sentences of the English language, the procedural active syntaxeme in the position of the nuclear predictive component (NP2) on the basis of a subordinative connection can be combined:

a) with an object syntaxeme:

21. Who told you?

June (JG, 88) ⟶   June told me.

b) with an indirect object syntaxeme:

22. Who told you that?

   Miss June Forsyte (GFS, 151) ⟶   Miss June Forsyte told me that.

c) with an object-agentive syntaxeme:

23. Who told you to steel?

   She (DSC, 197) ⟶   She told me to steel.

d) with an object syntaxeme of the state carrier:

24. What makes you think?

   Nothing (SGW, 116) ⟶   Nothing makes me think.

25. What made you laugh?

Your answer (GWM, 46) ⟶   Your answer made <u>me</u> laugh.

e) with a locative syntaxeme:

26. Answer up, who goes there?

Riley Hinderson (DTH, 59) ⟶   Riley Hinderson goes <u>there</u>.

f) with a temporal syntaxeme:

27. Weren`t you going away for the weekend?

I was (PAP, 427) ⟶   I was going <u>for the weekend.</u>

g) sociative system:

28. Who was going with you?

Mannie Watson (PAP, 68) ⟶   Mannie Watson was going <u>with me.</u>

The sign of sociativity (compatibility) is most clearly manifested in combinations with compound prepositions "together with", "along with". Therefore, the possibility of replacing the prepositional combination "with me" with a combination with the preposition "together with" or "along with" can be a convincing proof of the presence of a sign of sociativity. Cf.: (28) Mannie Watson was going <u>with me</u> ⟶   Mannie Watson was going <u>along with me.</u>

h) with the syntaxeme of the method:

29. Are you going up by train this morning?

Yes, I am (CFS,160) ⟶   Yes, I am going up <u>by train.</u>

k) with an attribution system:

30. Has anything happened to you?

Nothing (JG, 118) ⟶   Nothing has happened <u>to me.</u>

In the Uzbek language, the procedural active syntaxeme in the position of the nuclear predictive component (K2) on the basis of a subordinative connection can be combined:

a) with an object syntaxeme:

31. – Сизни мен танигандай бўламан, – деди хотин.

– Мен ҳам (ГГ., 262) ⟶   Мен ҳам <u>сизни</u> танигандай бўламан.

32. Ҳусайн. Алишерни ким ҳалок қилмоқчи экан?

Гули. Сиз (УН, 404) ⟶   Сиз <u>Алишерни</u> ҳалок қилмоқчи экансиз.

b) with a temporal syntaxeme:

33. Азамат. Мен ҳозир тўплайман.

    Самсоқ ота. Мен ҳам (КЯ, 209)⟶ Мен ҳам <u>ҳозир</u> тўплайман.

c) with a locative syntaxeme:

34. – Тўрвангдаги дарвешми, нима бор?

    – Қўй (САО, 9)⟶ <u>Тўрвада</u> қўй бор.

d) with an indirect object syntaxeme:

35. Ғойиб. Сизга Олтинсойнинг нимаси ёқиб қолди?

    Гулюз. Одамлари (КУ, 1965)⟶ <u>Менга</u> Олтинсойнинг одамлари ёқиб қолди.

e) with a temporal-a priori system:

36. – Эртага қай маҳалда келай?

    – Тушдан кейин (ГГ., 433)⟶ <u>Тушдан кейин</u> кел.

f) with an object-agentive syntaxeme:

37. – Ким бўлиб ишламоқдасан?

    – Мен ҳамма бўлиб (ГГ., 374)⟶ Мен <u>ҳамма бўлиб</u> ишламоқдаман.

g) with a definitive object syntaxeme:

38. – Буларни ким олиб келди?

    – Аканг қарағай (ШЮ, 46)⟶ <u>Буларни</u> аканг қарағай олиб келди.

In the examples given, the syntaxeme in the position of the nuclear predictive component (NP2) is active, without any other additional syntactic-semantic feature. Variants of the active syntaxeme in English are expressed by the verb in the personal form (Vf) and the combinations "shall" or "will Vi", "have Vp2", "be Vp1", "be prS". In the Uzbek language, the explicating active syntaxeme can be represented in the personal form (Vf) by combinations of the adverbial participle (Va) + service verbs *"келмоқ, эмоқ, эмиш, кетмоқ, чиқмоқ"*; verbs (V) + *"р+экан, эди";V + "ган+эмоқ, (эдим, эдинг, эди, эдик, эдингиз, экан, экансиз)"*; verb forms of the imperative mood (Vimp) + моқчи, +эмоқ, with words *"бор"*. Some of them, represented by various tense forms of the verb, are connotative or shade variants of the active syntaxeme.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Мещанинов И.И. Члены предложения и части речи. М.: Наука, Ленинг. отд-ние, 1978, -587 стр.
2. Хожиев А. Феъл, Тошкент, 1973, 192 стр.

3. Бархударов Л.С., Штелинг Д.А. Грамматика английского языка. – М.: Изд-во Высш. Школа, 1965, -428 стр.

4. Miller F. Stative Verbs in Russian. Foundations of Language, 1970. Vol. 6, No.4. – 488-504p.

5. Leech N. Meaning and the English Verb. – London, Longmand,1971. -131 p.