

STYLISTIC FUNCTIONS OF THE VERBS WITH DESTRUCTIVE IMPACT IN MODERN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Gulmira B. Eskaraeva,

Lecturer

Department of Russian Language and Teaching Methodology
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Alina M. Khasanova,

Lecturer

Department of Russian Language and Teaching Methodology
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Akbar M. Mamirov,

Lecturer

Department of Russian Language and Teaching Methodology
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The study of stylistic functions of verb units is impossible without typological study vocabulary, which is designed to explore the most significant structural signs and trends in the formation of the lexico-semantic system. The author emphasizes the following ideas that are used in the linguistic literature: names of lexical associations of words: lexical-semantic field, lexico-semantic group, thematic group (thematic series), synonymous series. However, the research obtained in the article proves that there is still no single point view of the differences between these associations. The author considers the ratio of the field and lexico-semantic group as the ratio of general and particular. Lexico-semantic field is represented by such a union of lexical units, which, in turn, is divided into lexico-semantic group.

Keywords: Lexico-semantic field, lexico-semantic group, expressiveness, figurativeness, destroy, destructive, break, constructive, communicative function, aesthetic, lexical compatibility, multidirectional, lexeme.

INTRODUCTION

Since in each of the named lexical paradigms the units are combined based on the commonality of semantic parameters, and their clear distinction for the purposes of this study is irrelevant, in the work the terms "lexico-semantic field" and "lexico-semantic field" are used in semantic group. The specificity of verbal semantics is manifested in the fact that, as A.A. Ufimtsev, "the meaning of verbal lexemes is revealed, first of all, in implicit syntagmas determined by categorical semantics combining verbal and nominal lexemes, thanks to which the latter act as members of potential syntagmas, and the correlation of verbs lexemes with a subject series "manifested in models of subject-object localization of the verbal action" [12, 223].

E.V. Rakhilina rightly notes that "almost all the semantic properties of the verb ... are reflected in its main syntactic constructions - management models. Verbs whose meaning is object-oriented are called object [9, 34]. The expression of the object relations of the verb is in the language sphere related to the most essential, and in the system of each language a subsystem associated with the expression of object relations - "object subsystem". The object subsystem of the Russian language is characterized by the division verbs into two lexico-grammatical subgroups: transitive and intransitive verbs, while the difference of transitivity / intransitivity is transmitted in a lexical and grammatical way - by compatibility or incompatibility with the accusative case of the direct object. Category transitivity / intransitivity is a very important abstract lexical grammatical feature of the verb, necessary to characterize its values.

Transitive verbs that govern the accusative Yu.D. Apresyan's observations, represent the largest in Russian language class of verbs, and this class of verbs has the most diverse semantics. Therefore, transitivity by most scientists considered as one of the most relevant categories of this lexical grammatical unit. Since, according to Yu.D. Apresyan, [2,21] transitive verbs make up more than 50% of the total number of verbs in Russian, and their compatibility with the noun naming the object is obligatory, consideration object lexical compatibility of transitive verbs of the Russian language appears to be extremely promising in terms of isolating certain types of similar compatibility.

MAIN PART

When studying compatibility as a linguistic phenomenon, most authors comes from understanding it as the ability of elements to combine with each other friend in speech. It is customary to distinguish grammatical (syntactic) and lexical compatibility. When distinguishing between lexical and syntactic compatibility, all researchers proceed from a single premise that, as points out D. N. Shmelev, "the syntactic compatibility of a word is determined its lexical and grammatical characteristic, lexical compatibility – its individual meaning" [11, 76]. Mandatory orientation of the called action or process on an object expressed in the accusative case without a preposition is an important grammatical feature and a group of destructive verbs.

In recent years, the emphasis in the study of units of the language (and the verb in this regard is no exception) has shifted from system characteristics to functional. In this regard, the concept of discourse comes to the fore. If the text is considered as a complex of statements related to each other another on the basis of criteria of textuality, then the discourse appears as an integrative set of texts addressed to one common theme and functioning within the same communicative sphere (political discourse, advertising discourse, artistic discourse, etc.).

Discourse research thus focuses on what features of communicative speech activity and to what extent affect one and not another use of the language as a whole and a particular language unit in particular in a text system, through text characteristics of the discursive level are found culturally historical, social, ideological, cognitive forms interaction between the author of the text and the reader (6, 231 - 232).

According to Yu.S. Stepanov, discourse exists first of all and way in texts, but those that are followed by a special grammar, a special lexicon, special rules of word usage and syntax, special semantics, - ultimately a special world [10, 23]. Therefore, in modern linguistics, discursive-oriented analysis becomes relevant lexico-grammatical units of the language. In the second chapter "Verbs of destructive influence in the system modern Russian language" presents a general description lexical grouping formed by these units and considered types of object lexical compatibility of units included in it. Second is devoted to the consideration of the systemic characteristics of the verbs of the destructive impact. These verbs are distinguished on the basis of the integral feature "by physical impact, change the structure of an object, violating it integrity". In terms of lexical and semantic features, one can to assert that the verbs united by the archiseme "destructive impact", form in the lexical system of the Russian language lexical semantic field consisting of three parcels with the following nuclear tokens:

1. damage, that is, violate the integrity of the object, affecting on the surface microstructure (11 scratch, scratch, knock off, chip, tear, etc.);
2. destroy, that is, violate the integrity object, affecting its macrostructure (break, tear, destroy, cut)
3. destroy (burn, kill, demolish). At the core of the differences between these three groups, probably lies the logical-conceptual category of measure. If the item is destroyed partially and it can be restored - this is damage.

If destructive the impact is accompanied by a change in the structure of the object - this is destruction. If, as a result of a destructive impact, an object ceases to exist, is destruction. The main attention in the work was paid to the verbs of the second and the third group. An analysis of the object lexical compatibility of these verbs showed that that, the range of nouns that can be combined with that or another destructive verb, can vary considerably. Depending on how many lexico-semantic groups nouns are included in the range of object lexical compatibility destructive verb, we can talk about three types of such compatibility [1, 40].

The most frequent within the framework of the material under study is polygroup object lexical compatibility, in which the verb can be combined with nouns of several lexico-semantic groups. Such compatibility has, for example, the verb "разрушить", direct the meaning of which is "demolish, destroy, break." Due to its semantics, this verb is used primarily for destruction process designations:

- various kinds of buildings, structures (construction, building, house, hut, saklya, house, castle, bastion, church, temple, monastery, museum, school, hospital, mine, power plant, factory, market, etc.), for example:

В Ираке разрушены многие промышленные предприятия, административные здания, школы и больницы, жилые дома (Argumenti i Fakti (AiF), № 12,2008).

Но разве миллионы людей, годами не вкладывали свой труд...в те заводы, электростанции и шахты, которые пришлось разрушить (Chakovsky. Blockade).

- parts of buildings and structures (wall, furnace, partition, ceiling, bell tower, fence);

Ориентирами в его полёте служили чёрные пепелища, разрушенные колокольни (M. Matusovsky. Family album).

Горы разбитого кирпича, разрушенные обжигные печи, наводили тоску (N. Ostrovsky. How steel was tempered)

- communications {water supply network, railway tracks, road, bridge, tunnel}.

Звегинцев говорил о том, что финны при отходе разрушили за собой все мосты и дороги (Chakovsky. Blockade)

- settlements (city, village, settlement, village):

Только на территории СССР было разрушено 1710 городов и посёлков, более 70 000 сёл и деревень (AiF, №25,2008).

-water and irrigation facilities {dam, breakwater, water park, berth):

Некий председатель сельсовета принял «мудрейшее» решение разрушить плотину и спустить воду (V. Soloukhin. Vladimir Country roads).

Разбор завалов на месте разрушенного аквапарка закончен (АиФ, № 8, 2004)

- vehicles (aircraft)

Взрывная волна разрушила самолёт Шестакова (I.Kodgedub, Fidelity and Fatherland).

В одном кургане располагаются две древние могилы. Но одна из них была разрушена (I.Kodgedub, Fidelity and Fatherland).

-burials and monuments {grave, stele):

тракторами во время сельскохозяйственных работ (КР, 4 окт. 2009)

Стелы были разрушены, не на узком участке, а на достаточно большой территории кладбища (КР, 16 nov. 2008)

- natural objects {coast, island, rock, mineral):

Моторные лодки наносят непоправимый вред нашему водохранилищу, загрязняя воду нефтепродуктами и разрушая берега (Соттине, 7 Apr. 2009).

Но вот река с весёлой яростью бросает воды на остров, подмывая и разрушая его (G. Kononov. Origins).

На процесс выветривания влияют ... микробы, которые непосредственно разрушают горные породы и слагающиеся из них минералы (Science and Life, No. 5, 1985, p.94).

Combined with nouns naming chemicals and materials {plastic, metal, drugs, carcinogens, toxic substances, caffeine, vitamin, carotene) semi structure of the verb semi is modified, actualizing the semi "violate the integrity":

Среди бактерий и грибов на космической станции «Мир» были и такие, которые разрушают пластик и металлы (АиФ, № 50,2008)

Этот фермент разрушает многие лекарства, канцерогены, токсические вещества и ...кофеин (АиФ, № 4, 2009)

Based on the direct meaning of this verb, a series arises portable. So, it can be used to refer to the process destruction of any socio-political or economic systems: to destroy the country, economy, industry, economy, infrastructure, business, government, market, etc. For instance:

В Ираке разрушена и разграблена инфраструктура государства (АиФ, №19, 2009)

Причина, конечно, совсем не в том, что злокозненный католический Запад планомерно разрушал экономику православной Византии (АиФ, №22, 2010)

In addition, this verb is widely used in a figurative sense for the nomination of destructive processes in the biological sphere:

Алкоголь неумолимо разрушает печень (КР 21 march, 2005).

Химические вещества, добавленные в воду бассейна, разрушают белок ачюны (Vesti, № 10,2004).

It is possible to use this verb to denote a destructive process in relation to phenomena - mental sphere (plan, idea, argument, concept, word meaning, performance, illusion, fantasy) For example:

Он (Иван) создал и разрушил тысячи планов, но так ничего и не придумал (Boris Vasilyev. Were and were not).

Гудериан же своили слова разрушал одну из иллюзий, с которыми Гитлер не хотел расставаться (A. Chakovsky. Blockade)

- spiritual sphere (morality, moral principles, faith, religion, culture, personality, talent

Получается, нельзя кого-то ограничивать, а разрушать всё, что угодно - мораль, родной очаг, родную культуру - можно. (АиФ, №21, 2008).

Религия была разрушена не расчётливыми нигилистами, а выжили классами, первыми, потерявшими веру (Literature, №9, 2007)

- emotional (impression, feeling):

При первой же встрече этот человек разрушил впечатление, которое сложилось о нём (АиФ, №49,2006).

Но чувства влюблённых чуть не разрушил футбол (КР, 26 June 2008)

The verb destroy is also used with nouns, denoting a certain way or state of affairs (established order of things, idyll, way of life, discipline, harmony):

Мачычик получил семейное образование, но война разрушила семейную идиллию (Lit. newspaper, 17 January, 2004).

Но естественный ход вещей, естественную гармонию природы разрушают создатели очередной стройки века (АиФ, № 7, 2005).

The verb destroy is also used with nouns that call relations between people and between states (marriage, love, friendship, partnership, unity):

Эти разлуки и разрушили нашу любовь (АиФ, №19, 2006).

Такие исследования могут разрушить и без того хрупкое единство славянских народов (КР, 26 March, 2008)

In such phrases, the semantic structure of the verb loses specific semes, and it appears in the status of sememe. And in combination with nouns that call associations of people or states {family, alliance, army, opposition, group) verb to destroy acquires a secondary denotative meaning:

Путин разрушил все альянсы и группы влияния, которые сформировались к окончанию его президентства (AiF, № 29,2008)

Супруги могут не остановиться между конфликтами, разрушающими их семью (M.Matskovskiy. Family for your wellbeing).

Attention is drawn to the fact that some combinations with this the verb are perceived as occasional, although the nouns are semantically related to the nominal components of the usual combinations. For example, to destroy friendship is usual, to destroy partnership is occasional.

Thus, the range of object lexical compatibility of a given the verb includes a large number (at least 16) of lexico-semantic groups of nouns and acts in 3 statuses of sememes.

The analysis showed that among the destructive verbs related to polygroup type, there are those whose compatibility range is extremely wide and can include from lexico-semantic group nouns to an extremely large number of them, the absolute value of which defined and limited mainly to extralinguistic and stylistic factors (destroy, burn, break, etc.). Compatibility similar verbs tends to further expand, tends to become free, limitless. This feature allows you to distinguish it in a special subtype. [7, 84]

Other destruction verbs of the polygroup type are not have a pronounced tendency to expand object compatibility, and the number of lexico-semantic or thematic groups of nouns, capable of entering into combinations with them does not exceed 10. This, for example, verbs such as shoot, bomb, exterminate, etc.

Depending on the maximum number of lexico-semantic groups of nouns that can combine with one or another the verb of destructive influence, two subtypes can be distinguished polygroup compatibility:

1) polygroup A - range over 10 lexico-semantic group;

2) polyfunctional B - range from 2 to 10 lexico-semantic group. Here are some examples of verbs belonging to the specified subtypes.

The following verbs have polygroup compatibility destructive impact:

1. Verbs with a generalized meaning of destruction (violate, destroy);

2. Indicating the mode of action (pressure, burn, break, crush, crush, break, burn, break).

1. Verbs with a generalized meaning of destruction: smash, destroy, exterminate, crush, smash, ruin, kill, lay down, slay);

2. Verbs indicating the method of destruction (hang, hack, blow up, knock out, squeeze out, burn out, break out, cut down, corrode, knock out, finish off, choke, score, fill up, crush, stab, close, slaughter, hack, shoot, flood, trample, beat, break, cut, chop, mow, cut off, cancel, poison, kill, cut, shoot, saw, beat, extinguish, suppress, set fire to, break, sink, interrupt, slaughter, knock down, break through, break through, bombard, ruin, unravel, untie, break up, smash, dismantle, cut, saw, untwist, rip, tear, trample, shoot, tear down, tear down, erase, drown.

For verbs of a specific action, in general, a narrower range of compatibility than for verbs denoting a generalized process destruction. A monogroup is understood as such a type of object lexical combinability, in which a transitive verb is able to form combinations with nouns of only one lexico-semantic group, that is the associative potential of this verb is limited by the totality lexemes united on the basis of an integral semantic component. For example, the verb to execute is combined only with nouns, calling people, fall asleep - with nouns calling recesses in the ground, cure - with nouns combined the semantic component "disease", drain - a reservoir, etc.

The monogroup type can be attributed to the object lexical compatibility of the following verbs of destructive influence: shave (beard), weed (weeds), trample (crops), bury (pit), fill up (trench), execute (criminal), uproot (forest), heal (disease), drain (swamp), shoot (dogs), disperse (crowd), melt (ice), disband (squad), cut down (tree), torpedo (ship), extinguish (fire).

An extreme, degenerate (term by M.M. Kopylenko) case monogroup compatibility is monolexemia, in which a transitive verb can only be used with one noun, that is, the range of this verb is limited to one lexeme. So, the destructive verb to pierce is combined only with the noun eye. It has special semantic and syntagmatic properties. Verb to destroy, naming a process to which one may be subjected any object of the surrounding reality, which allows it to be combined with almost any noun.

Such a wide range of compatibility of this verb is due to the extreme simplicity of its semantic structure that includes only one seme "cause not to be." The stylistic restrictions on the compatibility of the verb can be destroyed so insignificant that they can be neglected. Therefore, the object lexical the combinability of this destructive verb can be interpreted as free.

Thus, we can talk about the existence of three types of object lexical compatibility of transitive verbs. The most common of these is polygroup, less common - monogroup. Free compatibility is a rare type. The emergence and existence of isolated within the framework of the material under study types of compatibility due to the following factors.

1. Extralinguistic - for any object lexical compatibility, the following pattern will be valid: than the more specific the process, the fewer objects it can have subjected to, the same object lexical compatibility, naming given verb process, and vice versa.

2. Extralinguistic factors are extrapolated to the area linguistic, in particular semantic, relations and determine impact on the object lexical compatibility of the following regularities:

a) the number of seme-specifiers is inversely proportional to latitude compatibility of a given verb, that is, the more differential semes contains its semantic structure, the narrower the range of compatibility, and vice versa (for example, the verb to destroy contains only one seme, and the semantic structure of the verb to pierce includes the following semantic components:

1. cease to exist
2. by pressing
3. sharp object
4. having made a hole
5. for the outflow of intraocular fluid.

b) the number of semis expressed by the verb lexeme, directly in proportion to the breadth of compatibility, that is, the more semis represent a verbal lexeme, the wider the range of its compatibility;

c) the compatibility of the verb is influenced by stylistic factors, which may limit its range to certain groups nouns.

These are the systemic characteristics of the verbs of destructive influence. At reviewing the texts of print media reveals a number of features functioning of destructive verbs in them. In particular, there is an increase in the frequency of the use of certain lexical units. Analysis of the relative frequency of the use of destructive verbs in media discourse within the framework of the studied material, it is shown that the following verbs have the highest frequency: destroy (violate), destroy, kill, beat (smash, knock down), destroy, blow up, break.

The high particularity of the use of the first two verbs is quite justified, since these lexical units call the process destruction, without specifying its method, therefore, can be used with a large number of nouns naming objects of various character. The frequency of the verb is explained as extralinguistic factors (used in reports of crimes and military actions), and actually linguistic - the absence in semantic structure of differential semes indicating the way actions, which determines the breadth of combination possibilities. Verbs to beat, break and their derivatives are often called destructive actions, which accordingly determines the frequency of their use in speech practice.

As for the verb to blow up, it used to not belong to the number frequently used destructive verbs because it matters "to make an explosion, destroy with an explosion" and was used mainly for designation of destruction processes associated with the maintenance of large-scale military operations or construction work. Usual is objective lexical compatibility of this verb with the following semantic noun groups: - buildings, structures, structures for various purposes military-industrial facility, school, hospital, headquarters, hut, house, palace, temple, church, factory, power plant, hydroelectric power station, mine, bunker, bunker):

Товарищ майор, неужели ГЭС взрывать будем? (A.Chaykovskiy. Blokade)

И если для этого понадобится храм взорвать, мы и храм взорвём... (B.Vasilyev).

Были и небыли) Что это? Кто взорвал бункер! (A.Chaykovskiy. Blokade)

-parts of buildings and structures {entrance, gate, wall).

При Стачине входы в каменоломни взорвали (KP, 20 March, 2008)

К сентябрю должны взорвать стены... (A.Tolstoy. Peter I).

- vehicles {fuel tanker, train, echelon):

Дина-2 взрывает эшелон (S.Gladisheva)

-weapon {mine, mortar, battery):

Мортирки взорви, а трёхдюймовую веди сюда (M. Sholokhov. Quiet Don)

Советским морякам пришлось, взорвав береговые батареи, перебраться на полуостров Ханко (A.Chaykovskiy. Blokade)

-communications (road, railway track, railway) and (especially often) crossings (bridge):

Уже только сотни метров отделячи его (танк) от взорванного участка дороги (A.Chaykovskiy. Blokade)

Советские части не успели взорвать люстры. (A.Chaykovskiy. Blokade)

- settlements (city)

Город цел, его не успели ни сжечь, ни взорвать (B.Polevoy. From Belgorod to Karpat)

- natural objects (rock, mountain, cave):

Пусть новым смыслом новый век увенчан, взрывая скалы, строя и трубя (Я.Белинский. В Елабуге)

Ему (Соколову) привычно было прокладывать путь по земле – взрывать горы, засыпать болота, покрывать асфальтом просёлки (А. Чаковский. Блокада)

- People (soldiers):

Русские солдаты, лишённые возможности продолжать бой, взорвали себя сами (А.Чайковский. Блокade).

The increase in the frequency of the verb to explode is associated with extralinguistic factor - the spread of terrorism and the fact that the media constantly reports explosions, organized by terrorists both abroad and in our country:

Последний подарок любителям взрывать дома, электрички, поезда в метро, машины с милиционерами - обсуждение в Европарламенте «плана Масхадова» (Argumenti i facti №6, 2004).

A large number and variety of objects that become a victim explosion, led to the expansion of the compatibility of this verb. For instance:

Говорят, что в Москве поймали смертников, которые собирались взорвать ядерный реактор в Институте им. Курчатова (AiF №33, 2003).

Ракета-носитель отклонилась от траектории сразу после старта, и поэтому её решено было взорвать (КР, 21 February, 2007).

Attention is drawn to the fact that if before the distribution terrorism, the object lexical compatibility of this verb with nouns that call people was sporadic, now such frequency combinations. For instance:

Пока нет официальных подозреваемых, можно лишь гадать, ко.му выгодно взрывать людей (AiF, №6, 2004г.).

Способна ли власть противостоять смертникам, взрывающим себя в толпе" (AiF №33, 2004)

Члены папестинской организации «Хезболла» ежедневно взрывают вместе собой десятки израильтян (AiF, №23, 2003)

Видишь справа ресторан «Абдулла»? Там неде.чу назад террористы взорвали свадьбу (AiF, Noll, 2009)

This verb has become so firmly established in the Russian linguistic consciousness that began to be widely used in a figurative sense (although modern dictionaries figurative meanings are not fixed in it), and this, according to Sperber's law, testifies to the importance of the lexical unit for the linguistic community!

Here are examples of such use of the verb to blow up in journalism:

Художник - он же, как разведчик, внедрил и рутинную жизнь взорвал (AiF, №28, 2003).

«Наезд» прокуратуры на ЮКОС может испугать весь крупный бизнес, «взорвать стабильность» (AiF, №29,2003).

Не взорвут ли мигранты хрупкий межнациональный баланс! (AiF, №47,2003).

Убаюкивали благостные реляции правительства о темпах развития, о росте благосостояния. Зачем же взрывать ситуацию? (AiF, №45,2003г.).

Метод оппозиции - политический шахидизм. Взрывать политическую жизнь – это единственный генерачный метод реачьной политической оппозиции (AiF, №7, 2004).

In all the examples given, the use of the verb to blow up creates bright expression and enhances the elocutionary effect. Occasional meanings in media discourse can also acquire other verbs, for example, kill, burn, chop, tomp, etc.:

The emergence of occasional combinations in the media discourse, due to the desire of the producer to create expression, is the basis for changes in the usual characteristics of the verb lexeme.

Thus, the analysis showed that the features of the use of verbs destructive impact in media discourse are due to its target settings. The need to bring to the attention of the recipient a certain information leads to an increase in the frequency of the use of those verbs, which reflect the most significant aspects of the period information field. And the need to evoke a certain attitude towards the information presented determines the use of expressive funds.

When analyzing the use of destructive verbs in artistic discourse against the background of a typical object lexical compatibility, occasional combinations of these units are revealed. For example, consider the features of use in artistic discourse verbs to break and tear. The verb to break - to break has the following seminal structure - "cause not to be, violating the constructive organization, bodies with a rigid structure, bend, press, acting on two or more multidirectional forces. The number of nouns entering into language in combination with this verb is large, and they may belong to various lexico-semantic groups.

So, you can break various tools, tools (shovel, drill, knife, blade, pencil, pen, etc.), plants and their parts (tree, branch), parts bodies (leg, arm, neck, back), buildings (house, barn), mechanisms (fanners, threshers), furniture (chair, table, chest). In such combinations, the verb used in its primary denotative meaning, are systemic and some combinations in which the verb in question has a meaning "drastically, abruptly change" and acts in the status of the semi (breaking habits, character, etc.). However, against this background, as occasional are perceived such combinations:

Девочка рассказывает: косогор ползет, ломая дорогу... (G.Kononov).

In this combination, the sememe of the verb loses the seme "body", "multidirectional forces", actualizing the meaning "destroy".

Дорога сломала стень напололам (V.Visotskiy).

In this context, all the above named semes and the semantic signs "divide" and "sharply" are updated, and the sememe acquires D2 status, but with a different set of semes than in the previous example.

Обычное спокойствие покинуло его. Ломая в себе внезапно вернувшееся чувство боязни, он говорил Чубатому... (M.Sholohov)

Аким отказывался. - Мы не можем ломать решения. Пойми же, Павлуша, что это для тебя лучше (N.Ostrovskiy).

Сломан обычный, привычный порядок жизни...! K.Chakovskiy.

In the given examples, the semes "destruction" are actualized in the verb and "effort", the rest are lost, which causes the transition of the semi.

Прозрачная весна над черною Невой /

Сломалась, воск бессмертья тает.

О, если ты звезда, - Петрополь, город твой.

Твой брат, Петрополь, умирает\ (O. Mandelshtam)

In this context, through an unusual combination, figurative picture: transparent spring air over the dark water of the Neva loses its transparency, acquiring a dark color, and, as it were, shifts, changing the outlines, which causes an association with a violation of integrity, fracture.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the occasional use of this verb by different artists of the word and in different contexts show the mobility of his semantic structure, which is modified in the context in accordance with the specifics of the individual-author's perception of the destructive process applied to different objects.

The examples provided clearly show that non-standard compatibility should be considered as one of the properties artistic text. Since in the process of generating artistic speech is carried out and the communicative and aesthetic function of the language. It seems absolutely indisputable that in a literary text syntagmatic relations are determined by the patterns of formation holistic speech unity, aimed at the implementation of the author's design and ensuring the corresponding impact on this design the recipient of the information. Two trends are combined in a literary text: on the one hand, striving for clarity, and consequently, for the regularity of the means, which is manifested in the usual word usage and the usual compatibility (this is how the communicative function is carried out), on the other hand, to expressiveness, figurativeness (this is how aesthetic and pragmatic function of language).

Expanding the combinational possibilities of lexical units in context is a means of creating an image. The meaning of words in literary text is enriched, acquires the ability to enter into various semantic connections and associations for a more complete expression the thoughts of the author, his feelings, individual worldview. This is carried out as a result of expanding the combinational possibilities of words, and also a specific, individual-author's organization of their semantic structure. Presence of a particular lexeme in the semanteme. Semis of various types enables the author by creating various contextual conditions to update some and neutralize others in order to creating an artistic image. The frequency of individual combinations, their functional load determine the originality of idiostyle and reflect the specifics of the individual picture of the world of the artist of the word.

The results of the study show that functional characteristics of destructive verbs have differences from their system settings. The nature of these differences is due the type of discourse and the purpose of the author. Within a discourse based on occasional uses can form a speech system, which becomes the basis for fixing this neoplasm in the system language.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Avilova N.S. The aspect of the verb and the semantics of the verb word. Abstract dis. for the competition scientist step. doc. philological sciences M., 1976. 40 p.
- [2]. Apresyan Yu.D. Experimental study of the semantics of the Russian verb. M.: "Nauka", 1967. - 251 P. 21.
- [3]. Arutyunova N.D., Paducheva E.V. Origins, problems and categories of pragmatics // New in foreign linguistics. Linguistic pragmatics. M.: Progress, 1985. - Issue. 16. - P - 42.
- [4]. Atroshchenko A.F. Syntactic compatibility of action verbs in modern Russian literary language. Abstract dis. for the competition scientist step. cand. philol. Sciences. M., 1967. 22 p.
- [5]. Afanas'eva N.V. Syntagmatic characteristics of the verbs "decrease" // Grammar and lexico-semantic studies in synchrony and diachrony. Kalinin, 1974.
- [6]. Chernyavskaya V.E. From text analysis to discourse analysis // Text and discourse: traditional and cognitive-functional aspects of research: Sat. / Ed. L.A. Manerko; Ryaz. State Pedagogical University named after S.A. Yesenin. Ryazan, 2002. P. 230 - 232.
- [7]. Kubryakova E.S. Verbs of action through their cognitive characteristics // Logical analysis of language. action models. M., Nauka, 1992. P. 84-90.

- [8]. Revzin I.I. On some issues of distributive analysis and its further formalization (as applied to syntactic analysis) // Problems of Structural Linguistics. M., Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1962, p. 13-21.
- [9]. "(Rakhilina E.V. Cognitive analysis subject names: semantics and compatibility. - M.: Russian dictionaries, 2000. - P. 34.
- [10]. Stepanov Yu.S. In the three-dimensional space of language: Semiotic problems of linguistics, philosophy, art. M., Nauka, 1985. 335 p.
- [11]. Shmelev D.N. Modern Russian language. Vocabulary. - M.: "Enlightenment", 1977. - P. 216
- [12]. Ufimtseva A.A. The word in the lexical-semantic system of the language. M., "Nauka", 1968. 272 p.
- [13]. Ufimtseva A.A. Types of word marks. M.: "Nauka", 1974. -205 p.