CATEGORIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF TEMPORALITY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Davlatova Muhayyo Hasanovna
Bukhara state medical institute
named after Abu Ali ibn Sina
The head of Uzbek language and literature,
russian and english department, PhD docent
hasanovnamuxa@gmail.com

In English, the lexico-semantic features of the verb and the grammatical form (passive case, adjective form II) are the elements that make up the resulting constructions in English. In cases where causative verbs receive a complex object, the semantics of the action verb used in the main predicate changes the status of the nominative argument when it arrives (the semantics of the state change is superimposed on the semantics of the quality in the secondary predicate), it is expressed in complex transverse devices representing the state of the subject.

Speaking about the productivity of Uzbek linguistics, we can cite a number of works performed in this regard (V.P. Nedyalkov; 1983, 23. V.P. Nedyalkov, G.A. Otaina, A.A. Kholodovich; 1974. P. 232 -251 V. G. Guzev, 1990, 165, D. M. Nasilov, 1983, 118–123, S. Mukhammedova, 2007, 225–226, A. T. Tybykova, 1988, 52–67, I. Nevskaya , 2008, 275–295, I. A. Nevskaya ; 2014, 305–313). These works are based on productivity studies in Russian linguistics. In the previous chapter, we thought about the fact that resultant meanings can be found in all languages in one form or another. As we saw in the analysis of English-language examples, in English the effectiveness is expressed in specific structures and, therefore, is studied in linguistics under the term "resultative construction". We made sure that in English the effectiveness is expressed not only by certain constructions, but in some cases it can be expressed depending on the lexical feature of the verb. It can be noted that comparative typological analyzes of descriptiveness, which is analyzed on a par with effectiveness, were carried out on the scale of the Turkic languages (I.A. Nevskaya; 2011, 171–175). In her article, Nevskaya focused on a comparative analysis of the semantic structural aspects of descriptives representing minor predicates in the Turkic languages.

The Uzbek language has complex participles consisting of more than one element, and in these combinations you can find the meanings of the result. A compound participle consists of two predicates, represented by a noun or noun category, and a personal verb. For example: a person has grown; swore. In these compounds, the verb component is syntactically independent, while the nominal

component is subordinate to the verb. These predicates are connected not only with the subject, but also with other components of the sentence, in particular with the object. *For example: The sun melted the snow.*

The nominative component, which is part of a complex sentence, has a predicative nature and in most cases has a figurative expression. The verb, in addition to completing the figurative and expressive meaning of the nominal component, also creates a certain semantics, such as a state, a change in state, an action. The component related to the noun in the composition of a complex participle has a figurative expression and serves as an addition to clarify the physical and psycho-emotional state of a person. For example: But *Qumrikhan was a different woman. She stood by this fire and swore to avenge her husband. He killed fifty-five young men and carved a printing press* (Said Ahmad, 96).

In the Uzbek language, effectiveness is expressed in a predicate. Also in the Uzbek language, special suffixes such as -an, -in, -il (marked, done, done, implemented) can be taken as performance indicators. Because these suffixes serve to indicate the result of the action represented by the predicate.

Efficiency, expressed by quality, can be assessed as a weak feature. For example, a change of state is expressed using the verb do (he cleaned the house). In Uzbek, efficiency is also expressed as an adjective. Efficiency in this case is the phenomenon resulting from a change in state. For example: Nimchis woven from crimson velvet are not worn (Said Ahmad, 39).

In this example, the expression of the meaning of the result is made using the gerund adjective and adjective: the pattern is woven. In Uzbek, analytical forms of verbs and complex verb combinations can have a wide range of meanings. In particular, a number of analytic forms of the verb can have resultative meaning. The effectiveness expressed by the analytical forms of the verb differs from the effectiveness expressed by the adjective in its syntactic function and lexical meaning. The effectiveness expressed by the adjective acts as a reference to the meaning of the predicate. *For example*: *Artik for some reason took pity on him and made him sad. Then he took a bucket and walked slowly* (Pirimkul Kadyrov, 248). When the minister took the jacket, he was fascinated by his strong body, bulging wrists and broad shoulders (Saeed Ahmad, 96).

In the examples given, the analytical form "became" meant a change in the state of a person. It is the lexical meaning of the auxiliary verb "to stay" that has the expression of the state. That is why the lexical meaning of the verb occupies an important place in the result expressed with the help of analytical forms.

Efficiency in the Uzbek language also has morphological features. In particular, the adjective with the suffix *-gan* and incomplete verb combinations *edi* form unique result structures. For example; *Shirimbetov became so numb that his legs*

buckled (S. Ahmad, 31. (Said Ahmad, 142). *Azizkhan had not laughed like that for a long time. He grabbed his stomach and bent.*

REFERENCES:

1.Васильев Л.М. Форма и содержание языка как знаковой системы // Вестник ВЭГУ : педагогика. Уфа, 1996, 3 : 39-42.

2.Problemy funktsional'noi grammatiki. Polevye struktury.Russian Edition | by Ed. by A.V. Bondarko et al | Jan 1, 2005

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

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

5.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.

6. 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).

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

8. 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.

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