
SYNTACTIC SEMANTICS OF THE INFINITIVE IN THE POSITION OF NON-NUCLEAR DEPENDENT COMPONENT

Oblokulova Mastura Mizrobovna
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Annotation

The given article is devoted to the study of syntactic-semantic signs of the infinitive in the position of non - nuclear dependent component in the structure of English sentence. In the process of studying and analysing the infinitive in the structure of the sentence were revealed the following syntactic-semantic signs: actionality, processuality and finality.

Keywords: Semantics, infinitive, syntactic-semantic signs, subordinate connection, dependent component, transformation.

The linguistic material indicates that the infinitive can be realized in the position of a non-nuclear dependent component and appear in the structure of a sentence based on a subordinate connection:

- 1.1. He wanted **to dig** hole (HMS, 9).
- 1.2. He didn't try **to be funny** (SNS, 46).
- 1.3. Gum was not heavy **to make** a plump line (MAC, 59).
- 1.4. I had meant **to be sarcastic** (CNDG, 74).
- 1.5. He was too busy **to paint** (JKMD,73).

In these sentences, syntactic units expressed by the infinitive **to dig, to be funny, to make, to be sarcastic, to paint** appear in the structure of sentence based on a subordinate connection in relation to the elements **wanted, didn't try, was not heavy, had meant, was... busy** and have various syntactical and semantic signs.

As a result of studying the infinitive in this position, syntactic-semantic signs of processuality were identified: action-objectivity, qualitiveness and stativity, action-finality, qualitativity, objectivity and action-effectiveness. On the basis of a subordinate connection, these differential syntactical-semantic signs can be combined with actional-desiderative, stative and qualitative negative syntaxemes.

- 1.1) He didn't want **to dig** hole.

The syntactic element **to dig** has the characteristics of processuality, actionality and objectivity. The syntactical-semantic sign of actionality is proven by transforming omission and verbalization: He wanted to dig hole → He... to dig hole → He digs hole. The sign of objectivity is established by us based on the results of passivization: He wanted to dig hole → to dig hole was wanted by him.

On the basis of a subordinate connection, an actional object syntaxeme can be combined with a processual desiderative syntaxeme.

- 1.2) In the sentence He didn't try to be funny, the element **to be funny** expresses qualification and stativity, which is proven by the following transformations (omission, verbalization and restoration): He didn't try to be funny → he to be funny → he is funny → he feels funny → he is in the state of funny. On the basis of a subordinate connection, a qualificative stative syntaxeme can be combined with a processual actional negative syntaxeme.

- 1.3) In the sentence Gum was not heavy to make a plump line, the infinitive **to make** expresses activity and finality (goal), which is proven by the transformation by adding the element in order to:

Gum was not heavy to make a plump line → Gum was not heavy in order to make a plump line. The syntactic elements “**was not heavy**” express qualification, quality and negativity. Gum is defined as a substantial syntaxeme - a carrier of qualitative characteristics.

1.4) In the sentence I had meant to be sarcastic, the syntactic element **to be sarcastic** expresses the syntax “qualitativeness” and “objectivity”. On the basis of a subordinate connection, this syntaxeme is combined with a processual actional syntaxeme.

In the last sentence, the infinitive **to paint** expresses actionality and result. The specified sign is proven by transformation - expansion: He was too busy to paint → he was so busy that he couldn't paint.

Let's study the following sentences:

1.4. He simply wouldn't know what to look for (JKLA, 158).

1.5. I won't say a word to stop her (ECHT. 67).

1.6. He had fought off an impulse to return to Houston Street (SGDL,185).

In sentence (1.4), the syntactic element **to look for** appears in the structure of sentence based on a subordinate connection and is endowed with a syntactic-semantic sign of actionality and is combined with an objective relative syntaxeme. This is confirmed by the fact that this sentence is amenable to transformation - passivization:

He simply wouldn't know what to look for → what to look for wouldn't be simply known by him.

The component and syntaxeme models of this sentence look like this:

1 2 3 4

He...wouldn't know what to look for

$$\frac{NP_1}{SbAg} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{PrAcNg} \cdot \frac{\bar{ND}}{ObR_1} \cdot \frac{\bar{ND}}{PrAc};$$

In sentence (1.5), the infinitive is endowed with the syntactical-semantic sign of actionality and finality (goal). The sign of finality is confirmed using the transformation method - adding an element **in order to**:

I won't say a word to stop her → I won't say a word in order to stop her.

The actional final syntaxeme based on the subordinate connection is combined on the right and left with the substantial objective syntaxeme. From the analysis of the component composition of this sentence and the meanings of its elements, it is clear that the elements **a word** and **her** must be defined as substantial objective syntaxeme. They can be visualized like this:

1 2 3 4 5

$$I\ won't\ say\ a\ word\ to\ stop\ her. \frac{NP_1}{SbAg} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{PrAcNg} \cdot \frac{\bar{ND}}{SbOb} \cdot \frac{\bar{ND}}{PrAcFn} \cdot \frac{\bar{ND}}{SbOb};$$

In sentence (1.6) **to return** is defined as an actional final resultative syntaxeme. In this case, finality is proven by transformation - adding “**in order to**”:

He had fought off an impulse to return to Houston Street → he had fought off an impulse in order to return to Houston Street.

And the result of this syntaxeme **to return** can be expressed by adding the adverb **enough** to the specified element: He had fought off an impulse to return to Houston Street → He had fought off an

The actional final resultative syntaxeme, expressed by the infinitive, on the basis of a subordinate connection, is combined with the substantial object syntaxeme, represented by the element an impulse, and the substantial locative allative syntaxeme, expressed by the syntactic elements **to**

Houston Street

The component and syntax structure of the above sentence looks like this:

1 2 3 4 5

He had fought off an impulse to return to Houston Street.

$$\frac{NP_1}{SbAg} \bullet \frac{NP_2}{PrAc} \bullet \frac{\bar{ND}}{SbOb} \bullet \frac{\bar{ND}}{PrAcFnRs} \bullet \frac{\bar{ND}}{SbLcAl};$$

In addition to the above syntactical-semantic signs, expressed by infinitive, other syntactic-semantic features of qualification are observed, such as “finality” and “stativity,” which is typical for the sentences given below (and 5):

1.7. I didn't come out here to be dull (HSHM.92)

1.8. You'd have lots of reason to be jealous (PAB, 3)

The syntactical-semantic sign of the finality of the elements **to be dull** and **to be jealous** is proven by adding **in order to**:

(1.7) I didn't come out here to be dull → I didn't come out here in order to be dull;

(1.8) You'd have lots of reason to be jealous → you'd have lots of reason in order to be jealous.

The elements **to be dull**, **to be jealous** are endowed with the sign of stativity. The following transformations-omission and addition in the structure of the same sentences convince us of this:

I didn't come out here to be dull → I to be dull → I was dull → I was in the state off dullness;

You'd have lots of reason to be jealous → you.... to be jealous → you should be in the state of jealousy.

In sentence (1.7), the qualifying final stative syntaxeme, expressed by **to be dull** is combined with a locative syntaxeme on the basis of a subordinate connection, while in sentence (1.8) the final stative syntaxeme is combined with a substantial objective syntaxeme.

As a result of the syntaxeme analysis of the infinitive in the position of a non-nuclear dependent component in the structure of the sentence, we reveal that the infinitive is endowed with syntactical-semantic signs of actionality, action-finality, actionality-finality resultativity and final-stativity.

References

1. CNDG – Carole Nelson Douglas. Good Night, Mr. Holmes. – Printed in the United States of America, First edition: October 1990, First mass market printing. – New York, 1991. – p. 2- 408.
2. ECHT– Erskine Caidwell. Horse Thief. – Modern English and American short stories. Compiled by M.I. Shishkanova and N.P. Vasilyeva. – Moscow, International Relations Institute, Publishing House, 1961. – 231p.
3. HMC–Hardy F. The man from Clinkapella / Collection of short stories. Completed by Brandukova M.A. , Novikova L.A. – Moscow: International Relations Institute, Publishing House, 1960. –150 p.
4. HSHM – Hemingway E. The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber/ Modern English and American short stories. Compiled by M.I. Shishkanova and N.P. Vasilyeva. – Moscow: International Relations Institute, Publishing House, 1961. – 231p.
5. JKLA – Joseph Kanon. Los Alamos. – Printed in the USA, March,1998. – 517 p.

6. JKMD –Judith Krantz. – Mistral’s daughter. – Batman books. Printed in New York, 1983. – 564 p.
7. MAC – Maltz A. Afternoon in Jungle / Collection of short stories. Completed by Brandukova M.A. , Novikova L.A. – Moscow: International Relations Institute, Publishing House,1960. –157 p.
8. PAB –Parker D. Arrangement in Black and White / Collection of short stories. Completed by Brandukova M.A. , Novikova L.A.– Moscow: International Relations Institute, Publishing House,1960. –157 p.
9. SGDL– Stephen Greenleaf. The Ditto list. Printed and bound in Great Britain by Hazell Watson and Viney Limited, 1985. – 383 p.
10. SNS – Salinger J.D. Nine stories. –Moscow: Progress publishers,1982. –Избранное. сборник сост.Бернацкая В.И.- на англ. яз.- 438 с.