

THE CATEGORY OF TYPOLOGICAL CORRELATION IN ENGLISH

Tilavov Shaxobiddin

Teacher of the Samarkand state institute of foreign languages

Abstract. This article analyzes the theoretical arguments of linguists and scientists about the category of typological correlation in English and Uzbek languages. In addition, the author tried to determine the category of correlation using examples using fiction in English and Uzbek.

Keywords. *category of correlation, juxtaposition, correlation of forms, morphemic analysis.*

The category of correlation occupies a special place in language systems, including the English and Uzbek language systems. It is a connecting layer at the lexical, morphological and grammatical levels. Relative forms are specific to personal and impersonal forms of verbs. All grammatical categorial forms of the verb are associated with relative meaning.

In the verb system, the relation category is quite independent compared to other categories, but it has been very little studied. Therefore, it is appropriate to start studying the grammatical category of a verb directly from the category of relation. This principle of studying relationships is accepted in many theoretical and practical grammars.

F. R. Palmer writes the following about this: "The voice is considered primarily because it is so different from other categories that it can be handled completely separately from them." [1]

Many aspects of the problems of relative categories remain equally unresolved in the Germanic and Turkic languages. M.M. Gukhman writes about this. "In the verb category system, not only in Germanic languages, but also in Indo-European, Turkic and Mongolian languages, in Caucasian and Tungusic-Manchurian languages, the category of relationship is becoming an increasingly ambiguous and contradictory problem" [2].]

The problem of correlation in English includes the following general and particular issues:

- a) The task of determining the ratio;
- b) identify some types of relationships (identical, singular and intermediate relationships);



2-TOM, 5-SON

- c) Analysis or morphologization of syntactic constructions related to the meaning of the relationship, i.e. identification of such "forms" as causality, identity, unity;
- d) Get, become, stay + II constructions characteristic questions;
- e) difficulties in differentiating the forms of a passive attitude from a complex noun-participle or homonymy of constructions that binary express the state and process;
- f) The problem of turning a certain ratio into a verb;
- g) The relationship between the values of the relation to transitivity and non-transitivity;
- h) issues of nominalization in relative constructions;
- i) The problem of identifying stylistically related options.

Many aspects of the ratio category have not been theoretically studied even in modern Uzbek. The unresolved problems of Uzbek linguistics include:

- 1) There is no general definition of the ratio;
- 2) The relationship of the ratio with the transitional and non-transitional categories;
- 3) To determine the difference between the paradigm of relative forms and the paradigm of word formation.

The issues of mutual opposition of forms of attitude in the Uzbek language, morphemic analysis of forms of attitude, application of the transformational method to the category of attitude, research of non-nominalized and nominalized synonymous variants of the category of attitude are practically not studied.

There are some difficulties in explaining the content of the category of relation based on the basic laws of logic, that is, despite the difference between the grammatical subject and the grammatical object, they are considered to be exactly the same.

V.Z. Panfilov pointed out the general disadvantages of mixing logical and grammatical features when describing the category of relationship defines the category of relationship as follows: "The category of relationship is the possessor (grammatical subject) and complement (grammatical object), understood from the verb and directed to its specific form — the subject of action and the object," describes the relationship between

In English, this is a more difficult task. First, let's give some definitions of some linguists regarding the structure of relative meaning:

G. Suite defines this relationship as follows: "By pledge, we understand the various grammatical ways of expressing the relationship between a transitive verb and its subject and object." [4]

Barkhudarov L.S., Stilling D.A.; He defines that "the relative category of the verb expresses a different orientation of work — action in relation to the performer." [5]



2-TOM, 5-SON

Zhigadlo V.I., Ivanova I.P., Iofik L.L.: "The relative category of a verb reflects the expression of its subjective and objective attitude to action in the form of a verb." There are many similar definitions in English.[6]

The category of relations is considered as a general macropole consisting of several semantic subgroups, that is, micropoles. We will deductively identify these small groups of relations and consider these types of categories of relations in both language systems, taking into account the properties of isomorphism and allomorphy.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Palmer F. R. A Linguistic study of the English verb, Langmans, London, 1965. 384 p.
2. Гухман М.М. Развитие залоговых противопоставлений в германских языках. М. 1954. 369 с.
3. Панфилов В.З. Грамматика и логика. М–Л. 1963. 230 стр.
4. Sweet H. A new English Grammar. Part I pp. London; Oxford University press, 1940. 499 p.
5. Бархударов Л. С., Штеллинг Д. А. Грамматика английского языка М. «Высшая школа», 1965. 423 с.
6. Жигадло В.Н., Иванова И.П., Иофик Л.Л. Современный английский язык. Теоритический курс. М. Лит. на иностр. языке 1956. 350 с.

