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Abstract: The article focuses on a deep analysis of English and Uzbek sentences with language units expressing locateness category. The work contains main theoretical issues of world linguists including results of English, American, Russian and Uzbek linguists. There is a survey of theoretical literature, results and present state of the problem of the research. All tasks in the research work are logically connected and follow each other. The work contains interesting information for studying theoretical and practical aspect of English and Uzbek grammar. The classification, done by the author, can be a ground for further grammar investigations and can serve as a material for compiling manuals on theoretical and practical grammar. Theoretical analysis is proved by a numerous examples of English and Uzbek locative syntaxemes. The sentences with them are taken from original works of English and Uzbek writers, and this deserves a special value. A precious part of the work is comparative analysis of the English and Uzbek syntaxemes with the expression of locative category and deep linguistic analysis on locateness category. The work clearly reflects similarities and differences in this aspect in both analyzed languages: English and Uzbek. The research work points at author’s broad outlook and excellent skills in scientific analysis. The research work ends with author’s valuable conclusions and has both theoretical and practical significance. The style of the research work is scientific.
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1 INTRODUCTION

In this work the components in the meaning of locativity are analysed by revealing syntaxemes in Uzbek and English languages. In analyzing the components of the sentence by revealing the semas, firstly, it is specifying the different categorical signs, we must define categorical features. They are “processuality”, qualificativity, substantiallity. It is known that, the term processuality means “process”, which is contrasting with qualitative, substantial signs. Processuality is the one of the categorical syntactic-semantic features, it reflects itself as an action actionality, actional directed and state in the syntactic level and also other noncategorial signs. The lexical source of processual syntaxeme in the structure of the sentence are expressed especially by verbs, infinitives, Participle I, Participle II and at the same time they can express different types of noncategorial differential syntactic-semantic signs.

2 PROCEDURE FOR PAPER SUBMISSION

2.1 Review Stage

Some linguists for example, L.C. Barxudarov and X.A. Shetleev while advising to differentiate the actional verbs from stative action verbs on the base of lexical meanings of the verbs as transitive and intransitive forms, According to the notation of Uzbek linguist A.Xojiyev, “Verb expresses action, state, psychological condition and biological process” [14, p.4]. So, on the base of processuality it is admitted that verb expresses action or state, but differentiating action or state from each other is still unsolved problem. According to J. Miller, in order to differentiate syntactic forms which reflect stativity there are 3 rules: a] the verbs which express state are not used in imperative sentence as adjectives; b] the verbs, which express state are not used in the continuous forms; c] the verbs expressing state are not used with adverbs, which express adverbial modified of manner [15, p.493]. But to our mind the verbs, expressing actional and stative syntaxemes should be different from each other on the base of distributive in the structure of the sentence and their relation with other syntaxemes. Qualificativity is one of the general categorical syntactic-semantic signs its difference from processuality and substantuality is that, it shows general definition of substantion or process. And this definition can express quality, quantity, measure, state. In the sentence structure its lexical source takes a shape in the collection of adjective, adjectivized elements the numeral and noun. According to F.M. Usmonov, lexical units which express qualificativity can unite with very how, rather, so, too, in Uzbek language жуда, кам, ена which are related on the base of connection. If qualificativity is reflected by a noun, it cannot be connected with demonstrative and possessive pronouns [16, p.119]. It is wrong to connect the reflection of both three categorical signs with parts of speech.

That’s why we shouldn’t confuse substantuality with noun, because we can reflect substantuality by noun, pronoun, adjective, numerals and even by adverbs. Processuality reflects state or action and also finite and non- finite forms of the verb, in some cases it is expressed with other parts of the speech. In analyzing sentence structure by revealing syntaxemes, it is taken into consideration that substantuality is reflected with the help of different kind of parts of speech in both two languages. They are only differed from each other according to their noncategorial differential syntactic — semantic features. While analyzing syntactic elements which express locativeness we especially deal with lexical units which has substantiality. Locative syntaxeme or reflection of place in the example of English language can be expressed by
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the combination of preposition +noun, in Uzbek noun + case endings suffixes of case. But they cannot always be the source of substantial locative sema.

For example: We sat in the hay [5, p.156] In this sentence “in the hay” expresses substantuality and noncategorial differential syntactic- semantic locative syntaxeme. To prove this syntaxeme we can change the element which reflects substantial locativity with different adverbial elements: We sat in the hay → we sat here/there [5, p.156] or we can see this boy by putting interrogative pronoun where?

We sat in the hay → Where did we sat?

We can also see this condition in the example of Uzbek language:

Тошкентда қаҳра моннинг ېзувчи жияни бор.

In this sentence we can also change syntactic forms into adverbial elements “у ерда, шу ерда”

Тошкентда қаҳрамоннинг ېзву چчи ярим бор → У ерда қаҳрамоннинг ېزувчи жияни бор → Қаерда қаҳрамоннинг ېزувчи жияни бор?

As we said substantial locative syntaxeme is reflected in different forms.

3 THE EXPRESSION OF LOCATIVE ADITIVE SEMAS.

Some Russian scientists call the locative adessive semas as “private locative” or in ordinary way “locative”. [17, p. 266] Other variants of locative semas are divided into groups of locative allative, locative ablative, locative translative, locative possessive. In our opinion, if we call the elements which reflect the attitude of place with the term locative adessive it will give a chance to have more precise imagination about these forms. In the dictionary of O.S.Axmanova the word “adessive” is defined: “...it is the categorical form which indicates locative possessive, way of action meaning of case” [18, p.33] The term “locative adessive” is used in some monographic works. [19, p.14]

To sum up, locative adessive sema expresses the syntactic forms which reflect person, the location of subject, taking place from that location and also occurring an action in the location. In English language we can see that locative adessive sema is reflected with noun with the help of different prepositions:

1. At+N: We spent two very pleasant days at Oxford [7, p. 170]
2. In+N: I dropped at the train in Milan [5, p.169];
3. On+N: We had decided to sleep on board [7, p. 86];
4. Across+N: Susie heard Dr. Porhoit slip his hand across the river 5.Over+N: The oldman has was leaning over the chair [7, p.25];
5. Under+N: This will keep you safe under the water [7, p.98];
6. By+N: At Abingdon the river possess by the streets [7, p.133];
7. In+N: We spent two very pleasant days at Oxford [7, p. 170];
8. In front of+N: This card will be given you at 3 o’clock tomorrow in front of Westminster Abbey [9, p.53];
9. Opposite+N: We were almost opposite the hotel now [10, p.21];

And also, we can see that this syntaxe is used in the combinations like: near+N, behind + N, on the other side of+N, between+N, round+N in different texts. Locative adessive sema reflects especially the place of action, subject and person. But, we should note that in Uzbek the suffix of case – қа, which reflects time and place reflects not only locative adessive syntaxemes but also temporal syntaxeme.

For example: У мактабда ўқида. У ёзувчидан ўқисмон панж а, ақиллаб куйдим;
5. S + четида: Тандир четида чўнкайиб ўттириб;
6. S + чида: Бир гўзам жўна чида бўлди;
7. S + кетида: Щитон кетида якч-чаккаси а рўмоли билан ўрб турди;
8. S + остienda: Аёлимиз қайрағоч остида бешкика суван ёғлғанди;
9. S + бетида: Ёр бетида колим ийрони сўраб олаберди;
10. S + боишда: Мен дориипган дала боишда оёк иламан.

Also we can see that this syntaxe is used in combinations like:
S + кўишда, S + бартида, S+ учдида, S + ёқсида, S + бўйида, S + тардида, S + теварагида, S +ўртсида, S + адоғида, S + четида, S + турида.

In general, the common features of locative adessive semas in English and Uzbek languages are described in these pictures (Look at the pictures number 1.1 and 1.2)

1.1-Picture.

English alternatives of Uzbek S+ қа corresponds the following:

S + қа → in + S
on + S
at + S
about + S

1.2-Picture.

English alternatives of combinations with prepositions:

1] S + [нинг] устида
2] S + [нинг] тайгида
3] S + [нинг] оркасида
4] S + [нинг] олдида/ёнида

by/near + S
in front of S
While reflecting the locative adessive syntaxeeme we can see across prepositions in, on, at, about, across, over, under, at the bottom of, behind, on the other side of, by, near, in front of, against, opposite, around, among.

The alternatives of these syntaxeemes in Uzbek language are: устida, остида, ташида, оркасида, олисида, энсида, қаришисида, атрофuida, ичида, теварагида, ұртасида, орасида. We should note that in Uzbek sometimes the locative adessive syntaxeeme might have the possessive meaning. Example: Далалапим илон кўрдим.

Possessivity is formed by adding suffix –им to locative syntactic unities, and also, this sentence is appropriate for nominalizational transformation. Далалапим илон кўрдим → Далалапимнинг илони. But such kind of rule is not appropriate for English language.

According to analyses of facts, in the sentence structure we can find U.Cheff suggests that we should consider all the verbs which take location from one precise point as “locative verbs, because they can combine with locative adessive syntaxeeme naturally [20, p.361].

These verbs are be – бўлмоқ, have – эга бўлмоқ, to sit down – ўтирошқ, put – кўймоқ, lie – ётишқ, sleep – уқламоқ, live – яшамоқ, сату – ташимоқ, work – ишламоқ and so on. Besides this, locative adessive syntaxeeme may be subordinate to the verbs which reflect mental activities of human: study – ўқишқ, таҳсил олишқ, think – ўйламоқ, write – ёзмоқ, become – бўлмоқ, understand – тушунмоқ, believe – ишонмоқ, play – ҳўйнамоқ, discuss – муҳокама қилмоқ, фикрлашмоқ and others.

Sometimes locative adessive syntaxeeme may appear among the verbs which express behavior and oral speech. Among them we can find all the variants of locative adessive syntaxeeme.

Locative adessive semas in both languages can be used in the position of non nuclear dependent component; they can be related with different semas on the base of subordinative connection. These connections can be seen in the following picture.

(Look at picture 1.3)

**Explanation of semas in the picture:**
SbLaAd-substantial locative adessive; SbOb-substantial object;
Sbld2-identifying substantial; Ps-possessive; Tm-temporal; Q1t- qualitative;
Ac-actional; AcOb-actional objective; Ex-existential; Lc AL-locative allative St-stative; MdSt-modal stative; Qun-quantitative; NgEx-negative existential; AcDr - actional directive.

4 THE EXPRESSION OF LOCATIVE ALLATIVE

SEMA

While the locative adessive sema expresses the place, location or space of the person or object, the locative allative sema indicates the direction of object or person to place in an implicit or explicit way. L.N. Badanina just mentioned that in determining substantial locative allative sema, Jack ran for the train “for the train” could express the locative allative sema. She notes that for + train can be changed from the adverbial elements to there: Jack ran for the train → Jack ran there. You can also change for-train to express the direction.

Jack ran for the train → Jack ran in the direction of the train. At the same time we can put the interrogative pronoun “where?” to the combination “for train”. Where did Jack run? In the meantime, to the combination for + train we can use the interrogative pronoun where? [19, p.33]. In this case the alliative syntaxeeme should be contrasted to in front of the ablative syntaxeeme. This is because the ablative differential syntactic-semantic sign represents the movement of the action away from the object or location In English and Uzbek, a syntactic expression that represents the locative allative syntaxeeme in the position of non nuclear dependent component. It is related on the base of subordinative connection with verbs. Certain linguists argue that such verbs represent the meaning of the aspect category [21 p.39].

For example, a motion verbs which indicate termination to leave, to depart, to move, to enter, to go in, to go, to come in, to fall down, to come, to rise, to rise, to go upstairs, to mount, to go abroad, and so on, which represents the continuity of action to walk, to go, to make a way, to run, to fly, and so on.

In general, the English locative allative syntaxeeme has the following variants:
1. to + S: I came to the Thames [7, p. 149];
2. for + S: He left for Mecca [8, p.71];
3. in + S: I put it in my pocket [4, p. 9];
4. on + S: They put heavy things on top [8, p.38];
5. into + S: We went into the parlour [6, p.166];
6. over + to + S: I went over to Paris [3, p. 148];
7. at + S: Susie sat at the open window [9, 173];
8. by + S: We left the boat by the bridge [7, p. 30];
9. in front of + S: Haddo put it in front of the horned viper [8, p.48];
10. towards + S: We were walking towards the river [1, p.141];
11. against + S: He leaned against the wall and stared at them [2, p. 80].

Also, the one more variant of syntaxeeme may be expressed by means of the adverb of place: George rushed downstairs [7, p. 99].

In the Uzbek language the expression of locative allative syntaxeeme which can be expressed by adding suffixes -га, -га, -га to the noun expressing place, those suffixes denote the direction to the place. Researchers believe that “the noun is joined to is also governed by the verb, and the action understood by that verb represents” [22, p.114].

Therefore, the locative allative sema represents directed action or state, expressed place.

As the Uzbek linguists notes, “... in some cases, without adding dative case suffixes to the nouns they can be expressed directed action or state to the place. Хўжайин Самарканд бошса, тўғри бизниги сороби пушар эди. Besides this some adverbs as “ичкари, ташкари, нари, бери” expressing directed action or state to the place they can be related without suffixes of dative case. There were such suffixes -гари, -қари, -ри(п) they are considered
historically indicators of dative case. However, the use of this phrase in the present-day Uzbek language is also an anomalous phenomenon: "У ичкируа кирди. Мен ташқарига чикди" [19, p. 154-155].

The locative allative syntaxemes in the Uzbek sentence are expressed in the following way:

1. S + ға: Шу кетишидга қийнани борибди;
2. S + ға: Анда шу ўриндина бориб ўтириб туринг;
3. S + ға: Олпешо товуқлари љаттиқка қуйиб киргизди;
4. S + олдига: Шийлои олдига келди тўхтади;
5. S + остига: Озиқ моддарлар ғўстал остига тушди;
6. S + кеттига/оқрасига: Болалар кеттига кўл беткитди;
7. S + устига: Таҳта устига чигит қўлдиган;
8. S + тарғаға: Бобомиз биридан сой тарғаға чопдаги;
9. S + бошқа: Арик қўпалаб суве бошкага бордим;
10. S + ичига: Апир иғлаб сув бўстига борди;

In addition to examples which are given above, here locative allative sema can be formed with such adverbs below: Забт билан ичкиру жўнадим; Зиёд директоримиз олдига бордим; Босинг оққан тарғаға қоч.

In the Uzbek language, the nouns indicate the locative allative sema with the dative case suffixes can be formed by adding suffix of possessivity that’s why they also express possessive sema to additional to locative allative sema: Дапларимга сўдрама арава солдим.

The expression of possessiveness in such kind of is not seemed in English. In both languages, there is a reference to the direction of movement: here – бу ёқка, шу ғерага, there – ўша жойига, негар – ёнинг, behind – арқасиға, outside – ташқарига, upstairs - юқорига, inside – ичкиру, backward – орқа томонига, southword – жануб томонига, homeward – ўша ёққа, ўша ўтириб туриган. However, the adverbs expressing place in Uzbek and the nouns have suffix of dative case and possessive sema with the dative case suffixes can be formed by adding suffix of possessivity that’s why they also express possessive sema to additional to locative allative sema: Дапларимга сўдрама арава солдим.

It should be noted that from+S does not always expresses locative allative sema on the base of subordinative connection can be related with the following syntaxemes. 

5 THE EXPRESSION OF LOCATIVE ABLATIVE SEMA.

Ablative syntactic-semantic sign is a semantically comprehensive sema. O.S.Akhmanova notes that the ablative case of meaning matters, for example in Latin, the categorical form of this case is “аблатив of material”, “аблатив of time”, “аблатив of quality”, “аблатив of manner”, “аблатив of source”. It can also act as a spatial agreement, in addition to the expression “annotations of actions” or “annotations of sources” [18, p. 27-28].

In English Uzbek S + ra can be expressed in the following way

Because of the change in the form of the verb “to tickle” from active to passive, the ablative sign is added to the verb. In English, this sign is added to the verb “to tickle” in the passive voice. For example:

He tickled the pup out of the corner.

In this sentence, on Sunday “яқшанбага” syntactic unit does not represent the locative ablative syntactic-semantic sign. It contains the temporality sema from the non-categorical syntactic-semantic signs. About this temporal sign Ch. J. Fillmore and V.N. Petrash have a notable notions: "In the structure of the sentence "prepositions + S" expressing substantial temporal syntaxeme can be differed from other syntaxeme by means of alteration with the adverb "then" or putting question "when" [23, p.8].

So, above given examples can be fallen into these transformation:

My birthday fell on Sunday → My birthday fell then or → My birthday fell on Sunday → When did your birthday fall? Тугилган куним яқшанбага куннинг тўғри келди → Тугилган куним шу пайтда тўғри келди → Тугилган куним яқшанбага тўғри келди → Ќақонга тугилган куннинг тўғри келди.

Locative allative sema or locative adessive sema in the English language can be differentiating from temporal or locative adessive sema with the help of adding combination in the direction of. Compare:

1. We went to Datchet [7, p. 115];
2. Шу кеча уйинг борма.

As we stated below, the given examples can be fallen in such transformations:

1. We went to Datchet → We went in the direction of Datchet → Where did you go? or We went there;
2. Шу кеча уйинг борма → Шу кеча уйинг томонига борма → Шу кеча қаерға бормайсан? → Шу кеча у ғерали.

So locative allative sema on the base of subordinative connection can be related with the following syntaxemes. (Look at the 1.4-picture)

Explanation of semas in the picture: PrAc – processual actional; PrAcMd – processual actional modal; PrAcDr – processual actional directivе; PrAcCn – processual actional continuativе; PrAcNg – processual actional negative; PrMdSt – processual modal stative; PrAcRs – processual actional resultive; PrAcOb – processual actional object; SbPs – substantial possessive; SbOb – substantial object; ObSt – stative loaded object; PrSt – processual stative; SbId2 – substantial identificator; AcHr – actional hortative (imperative); SItHr – stative hortative.
from + S may express causality [reason] in the sentence. When this construction in the sentence structure in the position of dependent component to die, to suffer, to shiver, to cry and may other transitive and intransitive verbs, the transformation of the preposition from into because of can prove the existence of casual sema: One of the horses died from the thistles → One of the horses died because of the thistles.

In the texts that we analyzed, the expression of the locative ablative sema in English can be expressed by the combination of nouns with different prepositions:

1. from + S: The dog jumped down from Arthur’s knee;
2. out of + S: Susie came out of the dressing-room;
3. across + S: He had swam across the channel;
4. over + S: We jumped over the hardly;
5. outside + S: Jawan took her outside the city;
6. behind + S: He took the box from behind the table;
7. round + S: I’ve found a nice place round the corner.

In the example above, instead of nouns prepositions here or there can be used to prove the presence of locative ablative sema in the units from Arthurs knee, across the channel, out of the dressing-room, over the handle, outside the city, from behind the table, round the corner.

Analysis of the above examples shows that the English and Uzbek languages in the expression of locative ablative semas. We found it needed to show this correspondence in the picture below In English syntactic units representing locative sema can be associated with units having different syntactic-semantic signs based on subordinate connection: (Look at the 1.6-picture).

The explanation of models defining semas:

LcAbl – locative ablative; SbOb – substantial object; Ex – existential; PrAcDr – processual actional directive; QlfQt – qualitative qualitative; Ps – possessive; St – static; AcMdNg – actional modal negative; SbId2 – substantial identifying; PrAc – processual actional; PrAcNg – processual actional negative; SbAg – substantial agentive; StNg – static negative; SbPs – substantial possessive.

6 THE EXPRESSION OF LOCATIVE TRANSLATIVE SEMA

The translative sema, which can be seen in the specter of locative syntaxeme in the position of non nuclear dependent component in the sentence on the basis of subordinative syntactic connection. E.L. Tsiurinkova uses the term “meditative” instead of the translative term in locating the translatable syntax. On the base of the meditative syntactic-semantic sign, can be differed locative instrumental and locative translative syntaxemes. The scientist also suggests the ways to differentiate between these syntax [26, p 215].

Examples: 1. Some 3000 miles of 6 and 8-in line were laid from Calcuta through Assam and Burma into southwest China; 2. … oil can be moved to Europe and North by way of Cape of Good Hope from the US, of from South America. In these examples “through Assam and Burma; by way of Cape of Good Hope” syntactic units directly represent locative translative syntaxeme. E.L. Tsiurinkova in the example through the instrumentality of the police he was able to locate his relative the unit “through the instrumentality” called substantial meditative syntaxeme. However, from our point of view, it is substantial instrumental syntaxeme, because it can be changed with “by means of the instrumentality”. While determining the meditative syntaxeme, it is necessary to pay attention to the lexical meaning of verbs and nouns are connected with prepositions in the sentence. As T.T. Rustamova said “… the locative translative syntaxeme is only in place where the verbs expressing action should be depended them. Locativite is related with the verbs with different lexical semantic groups on the base of subordinative connection” [27 p.20]. Besides that, the investigator thinks that in some sentences by+S will express some verbs in the
position of predicate [to stand – турмоқ, to walk – саўр қилмоқ and etc.] and express the locative “transitor” syntaxeme. But, in this situation the term “transitor” no longer corresponds, because it is with verbs lexic meaning, connected with transitive and intransitive verbs. In T.T.Rustamova’s examples, two types of locativity are explained: He stood by the door → He stood there. He walked by her boarding house → He walked by there [28, p. 195].

In our opinion, in the first sentence by the door expresses the locative adessive syntaxeme, in the second sentence by her boarding house – the locative transitive will be changed with syntaxeme. Because in “by her boarding house” is a syntactic unit, the preposition “by” can be changed with “along”. He walked by her boarding house → He walked along her boarding house. But, the first example cannot be transformed like this: He stood by the door. He stood along the door.

The transitive differential syntactic-semantic sign may be contrasted with. Translative points to the action and mainly settling, expressing the places along, through, via made these prepositions. This syntaxeme is expressed in Uzbek like this: Бугун мактабдан ўтдим → Бугун мактабдан йўлчи қўлиб ўтдим. Compare:

1. She went along the crowded street;
2. He moved along the shore;
3. Then I started through the station;
4. We went off the road and on a path through the pine forest.

In these sentences the elements of along the crowded street, along the shore, through the station, through the pine forest can be transformed by the transformation interrogation while preserving the prepositions:

1. She went along the crowded street → Where did she go along?
2. He moved along the shore → Where did he move along?
3. Then I started through the station → Where did he start through then?
4. We went off the road and on a path through the pine forest → Where did we go through?

In addition, expressing translative semas noun with prepositional combination the part of noun can be changed by adverbs:

1. She went along the crowded street → She went along there;
2. He moved along the shore → He moved along there;
3. Then I started through the station → Then I started through there;
4. We went off the road and on a path through the pine forest → We went off the road and on a path through there.

Locative transitive sema in English can be expressed by “round + S, across + S, over + S”:

He was travelling over the world; We went for a week round the village;
He was tramping across America.

The other way of locative transitive sema in English can be expressed by means of “via + S”. As Yu.N.Mileshin mentioned that the combinations of “through + S, via + S” while expressing transitive sema it can also expresses instrumental, instrumental locative and meditative locative semas, but the meditative signs are auxiliary than transitive sema [29 p.138]. In real, the semas which appear with prepositions through ёна via counted as a connotative variant of locative transitive sema.

If locative sema with combinations through + S, via + S it demands to express the locativity when the verb expressing action representing going away to the final destination or to stay there.

For example: We came to Imola via Turin [5, p.148].

In this sentence the element to Imola in the position of non nuclear component, express the locative allative syntaxeme on the base of subordinative connection is related with predicate [came]. It should be noted that to Imola which expresses locative allative sema cannot be transformed to omission unit:

We came to Imola via Turin. We came … via Turin.

But in this sentence the syntactic sign [via Turin] which expressed the locativite transitive sema can be transformed and the meaning of the sentence can be saved.

We came to Imola via Turin → We came to Imola ….

From the analysis of the example, syntactic units representing locative transitive sema are accompanied by locative allative or locative ablative syntaxemes in the sentence on the base of subordinative connection. Representing locative transitive sema in this sentence can be called facultative variant. In theoretical and practical grammar of the Uzbek language, it is noted that syntactic units representing locative transitive syntaxemes are “one of the types that indicate the direction of movement” [30, p.155].

In the Uzbek language locative transitive sema can be expressed in the following ways:

1) S + бўйлаб: Йўлчи кўча бўйлаб кетди;
2) S + дан: Шералан калидан сузуб утди;
3) S + орасидан: Аширапи дараъҳтар орасидан югуриб кетди;
4) S + дан қўяри: Очиқ даразадан қўяри мўнадим;
5) S + ни орасидан: Ойчоним пахтозорни орасидан кетди;
6) S + ёнидан: Буғун Marktаб ёнидан ўтдим.

In the English language locative transitive sema can be connected with object, locative allative, actional, existential, actional directive, locative adessive, temporal, possessive, locative ablative semas, in Uzbek they can be related with actional, existential negative, locative allative, actional continuative, stative semas. We can describe them in the following diagrams: (Look at the 1.8-picture)

There are the explanation of following semas: LcTr – locative transitive; LcAll – locative allative; Ac – actional; AcDr – actional directive; LcAd – locative adessive; LcAbl – locative ablative; Ps – possessive; Tm – temporal; Ob – object; Ex – existential; ExNg – existential negative; AcCn – actional continuative; Sl – stative.

7 THE EXPRESSING OF LOCATIVE OBJECT SEMA

T.T.Kholmatova who attempted to specify objective sema states that “…combinations expressing objects of sema depends on single transitive verb or twice transitive verbs, when they are used with the preposition “by” it will be direct object”. Example: She shook me by the shoulders [9, p.163].

A.A.Malenkov in his works identified “substantial object”, “actional object”, “object actional directive”, “object quantitative” [31, p.15-16]. K.E.Tikotskaya defined substantial sema along with agentive object, stative loaded object, quantity loaded object, twice object, identified object [32, p.17-18].

A.M.Akbulatova demonstrated the ways of expressing
“possessive object” [9, p.13]. L.A.Suchkova divided semas into indefinite object, indefinite quantitative object, indefinite collective object, indefinite agentive object [33, p.15-16]. By seeing information given above we can realize locative object sema which was left out of attention. In order to define object sema in the sentence which includes object sema can be altered into passive voice. In this kind of sentences in the position of predicate syntactic unit comes which consists of transitive verb and it illustrates the action directed to object.

For example: She walked excitedly up and down the room [9, p.137].

Thus, in order to define object sema this sentence will change into following transformation: She walked excitedly up and down the room → The room was walked excitedly up and down by her. While defining the locative sema of this sentence, the element is conveyed location [the room] can be exchanged with here or there: She walked excitedly up and down the room → She walked excitedly up and down here/there. From the outcome of transformation can be seen that “the room” syntactic unit is able to express locative object syntaxeme.

Lexical encirclement plays an important role in pinpointing locative object sema. In other words, in the sentence structure locative object sema may take part in the base of subordinative connection after the transitive verbs expressing action.

In the English language after some transitive verbs can follow syntactic units which express locative object sema: to capture, to seize, to fire, to fall [into], to attract, to drive, to ride, to go, to leave behind, to pass, to out strop, to abandon, to come down, to descend, to choose, to elect, to stop, to cross, to mount a horse, to jump over, to walk, to go by, to miss, to cover, to run by, to make a hole, to precede, to give back, to return, to unite, to join, to fly over, to visit, to call on, to attend and etc.

Try to analyze the following sentences:
1. Land Abdulla visited the palace;
2. I must get home;
3. I marched the platform.

In the sentences given above syntactic units “the place, the home, the platform” are considered substantial locative object syntaxeme. Transformations are widely utilized when analyzing divided syntactic units which participate in sentence structure and mostly defining locative object sema. Compare:
1. Land Abdulla visited the palace → The palace was visited by Land Abdulla → Land Abdulla visited there/here → Where did Land Abdulla visit?
2. I must get home → Home must be got by me → I must get here/there → Where must I get?
3. I marched the platform → The platform was marched by me → I marched here/there → Where did I march?

All kinds of transformations are considered experimental analyzing method in our research, they are used to define different syntactic-semantic signs of all syntactic units in the syntactic construction. The syntactic units of defining object sema may come in various syntactic positions of sentence structure. For example, they can come in the place of nuclear predicated 1 (subject), non-nuclear dependent (ND) component, non-nuclear dependent predicated 1 (NDP1) component, non-nuclear dependent appositive (NDA) component, non-nuclear dependent homogeneous component (HND), and they express different connotative tvariants of object sema. However, locative object semas are used along with dynamic verbs on the base of subordinative connection and they will take shape of nouns expressing geographical places, certain location.

All syntactic units representing locative sema don’t match the information of sentence without object sema:
4. The people on the bank would stand [7, p.128] The bank would be stood on by the people;
5. She sat on the stone bench [7, p.156] The stone bench was sat on by her;
6. We met in the shop [7, p. 114] The shop was met in by us.

Syntactic units given in the examples “on the bank, on the stone bench, in the shop” represent a locative adessive sema, it is impossible to turn this sentences into passive form. Therefore, locative object sema doesn’t come in the place of dependent component of static verbs.

While analyzing syntactic units expressing the locative object sema in the example of the Uzbek language, it is observed that the noun is mainly defined by objective case – ни:
1. Автоматчилия ошхонани титди; 2. Сув дапани котирб ташлади; 3. Чувалгани ерни майин саклади.

In the traditional grammar of the Uzbek language the words ошхонани, дапани, ерни which are syntactic units are recognized as a direct object [34, p.113]. Look at the example from this traditional theoretical syntax in the sentence: “У Москвани курган” “Москвани” is defines direct object however, when divide this sentence into semas and then analyse them it is seen that in the element “Москвани” has not only object sema but also locative meaning. In an attempt to prove this, we use experimental analyzing method:
1. To prove object sema this sentence is transformed by the following way: У Москвани курган → Москвани у курган.
2. The presence of locative sema in the syntactic unit “Москвани” is determined by the following experiment:
a) The element “Москвани” can be replaced by adverbial units “бу ерни”, “у ерни” : У Москвани курган → У у ерни/бу ерни курган.
b) we can change this sentence with the help of transformation interrogate with the help “қаерни” : У Москвани курган → У қаерни курган?

It should be noted that in the structure of all mentioned objects there may not be locative object sema in traditional grammar. In the nouns which come in the function of object in dative case by means of subordinative connection with dynamic verbs which are used in the function of predicate in the sentence structure.

Therefore, examples given above can be transformed in three ways:
1. Автоматчилия ошхонани титди → Ошхона автоматчилия томонида титди;
   Автоматчилия ошхонани титди → Автоматчилия бу ерни/у ерни титди;
2. Сув дапани котирб ташлади → Дапани сув котирб ташлади;
   Сув у ерни котирб ташлади → Сув қаерни котирб ташлади;
3. Чувалгани ерни майин саклади → Ерни чувалган майин саклади;
   Чувалгани ерни майин саклади → Қаерни чувалган майин саклади;
4.Чувалгани ерни майин саклади → Қаерни чувалган майин саклади;

The locative object sema is defined in English with the help of prepositional or without prepositional combination of nouns, in the Uzbek language dative case of noun can be defined
without its morphological marker.

In both languages, the locative object sema on the base of subordinative connection among the processuality can be related with actinal modal, actional negative semas.

In addition, syntactic units representing the locative object sema can define possessive sema in the examples of Uzbek language. For example:

1. Мени омборимни шамоллатдим;
2. Менидаламни сугордим.

In the previous sentences syntactic units омборимни, даламни express not only the locative object sema, but also possessiveness with the help of possessive suffixes -ум, -м.

In this example of Sh.S.Safarov and A. Choriyev partly paid attention to locative possessive sema that the nouns come in the form of genitive cases. For example: Қишлолини баяз хотинлари, Дорионанни ышини мудиращи [35, p.15].

In English, when the nouns mean name of places in genitive case, they can be found in the structure of combinations the world’s great writers [8, p.234], London’s children [9, p.42]. However, in the Uzbek language the nouns expressing place, address can convey locative possessive sema with the help of accusative case and possessive suffixes.

8 EXPRESSING OF LOCATIVE INSTRUMENTAL SEMA.

There are a number of works on defining of instrumental sema in the English language. For example, L.N.Badanina separates the instrumentality in the connection of noun with preposition for; she bought an American stove for twenty francs [Cronin]. In the present sentence, noun unit [for … … francs] is used like a weapon or tool, and it is a verb to indicate the performance of a verbal action [19, p.134]. In this sentence prepositional noun unit [for … … francs] is used as weapon or tool, it shows the expressing of action [19, p. 134].

According to Y.N. Milieshin, the combination of “preposition + noun”, which expresses the instrumentality, comes after transitive or intransitive verbs in the sentence, and used in the sentence constructions on the basis of subordinative connection. Such a noun represents the performance of the action by means of weapon (knife, a key), body parts (hand, leg) and also nominalised units (a smile, a behavior, a look) represents the completion of the action, and the preposition can be used as auxiliary words [36, p.35].

When T.T.Rustamova analyzed the nouns associated with the help of preposition by in syntaxemes “They went out by the gate” identified only the instrumental sentaxeme and suggested that the following transformations could be used: They went out by the gate → They went out by means of the gate, not by means of the window. Or they went out by the gate → They went out through the gate. However, the presence of a locative syntaxeme in this compound is out of mind. The existence of this syntaxeme can be proved by the substitutional transformation below: They went out by the gate → They went out of there/here [20, p.227].

Some linguists confuse instrumental syntaxeme with mediative syntaxeme. In order to the expression of a mediative syntaxeme, verbs must include abstract notions such as learn, know, find. Also the noun units from +S, out of +S, through +S have meanings such as knowledge, a source of information, and that this syntaxeme is manefested: I knew about them out of books → I knew about them from books → I knew about them through books.

However, prepositions cannot be substituted for “with the help of, by means of” like instrumental syntaxeme. K.E.Smironova notes that the substantial instrumental sema occurs when with + S combination is used in the device, and shows the possibility of finding this compound by converting it to “with the help of+S, which means of+S” [37, p.18].

In the article of Yu.N.Milieshin focuses on instrumental manner, instrumental actional, instrumental causal sema, but argues that locative instrumental sema can be expressed only by “under + S, in + S” [38, p. 90-91].

In our view, the focus of the researcher’s attention should be on the lexical-semantic features of the verbs and the nominative lexemes that are intersections in the sentence structure when focusing on the methods of the expression of the locative instrumental semas. Verbs denote the subject’s apparent effect on the object, the abstract movement, the attainment of a particular point of space or location or the direction of it’s action and the relations that occur in the address. According to some linguists, local and instrumental relationships associated with the noun. If these two elements are separated from each other, there will be disconnection between them. According to O.R.Voronkova, V.A.Yashmanova “their separation is the result of a one-sided approach, and their development and differentiation are overlooked because there is a possibility of substituting space and instrumental representations, or replacing them with expressions of space” [38, p. 60].

Indeed in the sentence “Two friends had arrived on the train, in the combination on the train can be observed without difficulty two relations – space and instrumentality. The following transformation can be used to identify both semas:

Two friends had arrived on the train → Two friends had arrived here/there;

Two friends had arrived on the train → Two friends had arrived by virtue of the train.

In English examples the locative instrumental sema is mainly represented by the combination of nouns representing vehicles, body parts with the different prepositions of space and means in the performance of work:

1. I scrambled to my feet [9, p. 36];
2. Every animal was shown on the curtain [10, p. 49];
3. He spent most of his time in the saddle [12, p. 30].

In the examples given it is possible to replace “to my feet, on the curtain, in the saddle” with the adverbial elements if it is intended to determine whether the units are in the semiconductor. In addition to the “by means of, by virtue of, with the help of, with the aid of, by dint of” determination of instrumentality these transformations can be used. Using the above transformation does not change the meaning of the “scrambled, was shown, spent, heard, saw” verb forms:

[1] I scrambled to my feet → I scrambled here/there; → I scrambled by means of my feet;
[2] Every animal was shown on the curtain → Every animal was shown here/there; → Every animal was shown with the help of the curtain;
[3] He spent most of his time in the saddle → He spent most of his time here/there; → He spent most of his time by dint of the saddle.

In Uzbek locative instrumental semas can be expressed as follows:

1. Мен Деновга мотоциклдa бордим;
2. Елкaмгa кетмoнимни олдим;
3. Бaрчa пахта фронтa сaфaрбaр этилидa;
4. Мaктaбдa мoтoциклдa олиб бopиб, oлиб кeлaмaн.

1851
In these sentences “моторциклидə, елкамга, фронтига, моторциклидə syntactic units represent the locative semiconductor as well as the instrumentality.
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CONCLUSION

In the English language system we can't use term “adverbial modifier” for all adverbial modifiers. Because the term “adverbial” has two meanings but they don't mean one thing. First of all it's not correct to say that adverbial modifier can be expressed with the help of adverbs, because adverbial modifier can be expressed with the help of different morphological elements. In this research work we analyzed syntactic elements which express locativeness and we especially deal with lexical units. When analyzing a sentence structure as an object of structural syntax, it is taken into account that the syntactic interactions of its elements, and their differential syntactic characters are analyzed according to the modeling method. Due to locativeness category in the English and Uzbek languages there were sorted out locative adessive, locative allative, locative ablative, locative translative, locative instrumental syntaxemes their distinctive features were defined and their connecting opportunities with other syntaxemes were depicted on the basis of subordinative connection. The aim of the research work is to analyze opportunities of units which represent locativeness category in the English and Uzbek languages in comparative aspect. The object of the research work – locative units in the structure of English and Uzbek sentences and microtexts. Scientific novelty of the research work is reflected in the following: grammatical modeling of types of syntactical connections has been proposed in order to define the system-structural status of units which function in sentence structure instead of locativeness, methodological recommendations have been worked out for revealing paradigmatic row of locative syntaxemes, their differentiation and classification of variants of language units due to their functional peculiarities and accordace of their shape and content, similarities from semantic point of view and differences in structural composition of speech actualization of investigated units have been revealed, on the basis of comparative analysis there have been proved pointing at deictic and syntactic-semantic peculiarities, morphic-lexical and distributive signs of locative syntaxemes, interconnection of lingual essence of actualization opportunities of language units belonging to dictionary and grammatical levels with the conditions of speech activity of expression of locative conceptual semantics of compared languages has been revealed.
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