

FEATURES OF EXPRESSIVENESS OF THE POSSESSIVITY FIELD IN
COMPARABLE LANGUAGES

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Associate professor of the department of English Philology
Parvina Ilhomovna Khotamova

Abstract: this article provides information about features of expressiveness of the possessive field in both languages Uzbek and English. In addition, it gives several notions concerning possessiveness in both languages from prominent linguists and exemplify with the proven theories.

Keywords: *possessiveness, lexical-semantic, grammatical category, conjugations.*

The problems of the relationship between philosophical, linguistic and logical categories and their mutual dependence have been the subject of many assessments since the separation of linguistics from the philosophy of philosophy. These issues, which are directly related to the history of mankind, have been interpreted differently by brilliant scientists at different stages of the development of science. The most controversial aspect of the issue is that both philosophical and logical analysis find solutions to problems through language elements. It is appropriate to introduce some clarifications regarding the problem being analyzed. For example, the concept of "possessiveness" itself is one of the concepts that requires explanation. For this, first of all, it is necessary to explain the concept of linguistic field.

It is known from the history of linguistic theory that the concept of linguistic field was put on the agenda of linguistics since the 60s-70s of the 20th century and was developed by world-renowned linguists such as Ye.V. Guliga, Ye.I.Shendels, G.S.Shchur, I.I.Meshchaninov, Y.Trier, L.Weisgerber, A.A.Ufimtseva, J.B.Boronov, S.R.Rakhimov, A.Sh.Sobirov, etc., and these concepts were widely used in the process of studying linguistic categories [1,2].

We believe that the reason for using the concept of the macrofield of possessiveness in our scientific research is that it encompasses all means of expressing ownership.

In recent years, linguists have been paying special attention to the problems of categorization of linguistic phenomena, since the division of expressive means located at different levels of the language system into certain lexical-semantic groups, the identification of criteria that distinguish them from other language units, is one of the issues that is becoming relevant on the agenda of linguistics.

The ten philosophical categories listed by Aristotle cannot manifest themselves without linguistic means. Taking this into account, in the history of science, philosophers and linguists have been systematically familiarizing themselves with the ten categories distinguished by Aristotle and applying them to various fields. We also used Aristotle's method in categorizing the microfield of possessiveness from a linguistic-typological point of view [5].

Since the languages being compared in the analysis are of different structural systems, the category of agreement, which is the basis of the macrofield of possessiveness, was interpreted differently in both languages. Since English is an analytical language, it was found that the category of agreement has a controversial aspect. It can be explained as follows. As we mentioned in the section on the level of study of the issue, the very small number of form-forming suffixes in English led to the denial of agreement as a grammatical category. Therefore, its categorical status was brought into question. According to scientists, the category of agreement is not a grammatical category, but a syntactic category, because one of the two categories, that is, the suffix 's, which

is determined by the rule in the formation of the category of possession, is not added to the base of all nouns, and similar nouns express this meaning through various verbal combinations, for example: with animate nouns: *my friend's book*, with inanimate nouns: *the water of the river*.

In the Uzbek language, there are six conjugations, and the conjugation category is one of the basic grammatical categories. Therefore, we first conducted a comparative analysis to determine the similarities and differences in the conjugation of the languages being compared. The results are as follows [3].

The conjugation category indicates the relationship between words, the belonging of one subject to another, the relationship of the subject to the place, the fact that it serves as an intermediary in performing an action, and several other meanings. Since English and Uzbek are languages with different systems, the conjugation category in these languages differs from each other as follows: In English, the conjugation category is not well developed [4], while in Uzbek it is well developed. The two conjugations in English are morphologically comparable to the six conjugations in Uzbek: English.: Common case, Possessive case; Uzbek.: Bosh kelishik, Qaratqich kelishigi, Tushum kelishigi, Jo'nalish kelishigi, O'rin-payt kelishigi, Chiqish kelishigi.

The use of nouns in the accusative form in English is limited, mainly nouns denoting personal names are used in the accusative form, that is, in the possessive accusative form. In Uzbek, all nouns are used in the accusative form.

While nouns denoting personal names in Uzbek are in the accusative form, in English they are used with prepositions. For example, daryoning suvi - **the water of the river**, kitobning muqovasi - **the cover of the book**, soatning tsiferblati - **the face of a clock**.

Common case (Umumiy kelishik) is not marked in both languages, that is, the morphological index in them is zero. It is a big mistake to consider the English Common case and the Uzbek case as permanent equivalents, because a noun in the common case can also be translated using the six forms of the Uzbek case. When comparing this case with the Uzbek cases, nouns in the tenth case can be translated without a preposition and with a preposition:

When it comes without a preposition, depending on its function in the sentence, the Common case can be translated more often in the general case, and partly in the cases of arrival and departure:

Lanny turned into Adderley Street (P. Abrahams) — Lenni Adderli-street ko'chasiga burildi. But most of all he would miss *Celia* ... (P. Abrahams). Hammasidan ham Seliyani sog'inadi. *Lanny* nodded and lit *a cigarette* (P. Abrahams) — Lenni bosh irg'ab qo'yida papiros chekdi. Entering *the house* he went up the short flight of stairs to his room — Uyga kirdi-da, pastakkinadan zinadan o'z xonasiga chiqdi.

The students asked *the professor* for his new book — Studentlar professordan uning yangi kitobini so'radilar.

➤ When used with a preposition, the Common case can be translated into the Uzbek case of the accusative case of the verb qaratqich, tushum, jo'nalish, o'rin-payt va chiqish cases:

The prospects *of this corporation* was splendid (W. Woodward). Bu korporatsiyaning kelajagi juda yaxshi edi.

They brought him to trial and sentenced him to death for corrupting morals (W. Woodward). Ular uni sudga olib keldilar va axloq qoidasini buzganligi uchun uni o'limga hukm qildilar.

Even Charles looking over Marigold's shoulder dropped his pipe in astonishment (M. Joseph). Hatto Charlz ham Merigouldning yelkasi ustidan engashib qarab, hayratdan o'zining mushtugini tushirib yubordi.

Although nouns in the common declension are prepositional, in some idiomatic expressions they can be translated into Uzbek without declension forms:

to fail in love — sevib qolmoq.

• In Uzbek, too, the isolation of conjunctions alone for typological comparison does not fully meet the requirements of comparative typology. The translation of English nouns with and without prepositions into Uzbek shows that in Uzbek, auxiliaries are also used in grammatical connection with conjunctions. Therefore, we divide conjunctions in Uzbek into auxiliary and unauxiliary conjunctions.

English prepositional and unauxiliary conjunctions can be translated into Uzbek using auxiliary and unauxiliary noun forms:

<i>to graduate from the Institute</i>	-institutni tugatmoq,
<i>to come across a difficult word</i>	-qiyin so'zga duch kelmoq.
<i>to ask for help</i>	-yordam so'ramoq
<i>for my friend</i>	-o'rtog'im bilan
<i>for my friend</i>	-o'rtog'im uchun
<i>like my friend</i>	-o'rtog'im kabi
<i>besides my friend</i>	-o'rtog'imdan (tashqari) boshqa
<i>through my friend</i>	-o'rtog'im (orqali) dan
<i>through the garden</i>	-bog'aro (oralab)
<i>into the garden</i>	-bog' ichiga

It should be noted that while in English prepositions are mainly attached to nouns in the general agreement, in Uzbek pure auxiliaries are attached to nouns in the general agreement.

• Word order is also used to compare the category of agreement in English and Uzbek. For example:

<i>Men Karimga kitob berdim</i>	I have given Karim a book.
<i>Men Karimga kitobni berdim</i>	I have given Karim the book - I have given a (the) book to Karim
<i>Men y kichkina bolaga daryodan o'tishga yordam berdim</i>	I helped that little boy to cross the river.

• The prepositional and non-prepositional variants of the possessive case in English are mainly given by the unaccompanied and assisted accusative case in Uzbek. In addition, nouns in the English possessive case can also be given by adjectives.:

Children's room — bolalar xonasi;
a three days' journey — uch kunlik sayohat;
today's match — bugungi match.

Conclusion. Since there are six consonants in the Uzbek language, the consonant category is one of the basic grammatical categories. Therefore, we first conducted a comparative analysis to determine the similarities and differences in the consonants of the languages being compared.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Щур Г.С. Теории поля в лингвистике. – М.: Наука, 1974.
2. Усмонов С. Умумий тилшунослик. – Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1975.
3. Расулова М.И. Грамматическая категория рода в аспекте гендерной лингвистики. // Ҳозирги замон тилшунослиги ва хорижий тиллар ўқитишнинг долзарб масалалари. Республика илмий-амалий конференция материаллари. – Тошкент, 2010. - с.5-7.
4. Кононов А.Н. Грамматика современного узбекского литературного языка. М-Л: Изд. АН СССР, 1960.
5. Есперсен О. Философия грамматики. М.: Изд. иностр. лит. 1958.