

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF COGNITIVE STRUCTURES OF THE POSSESSIVENESS

Shukurova Zumratkhon Ismoilovna

*Senior teacher of the third department of English language integrated course at the Uzbekistan State
World Languages University*

Abstract

This article discusses the multi-level media of possessiveness in English. On the combination of their functional properties, the features of the pragmatic combination of possessive meanings. On the elevation of the possessive meaning "property", the author analyzes the differences in the ways of presenting the possessive relationship, the repeated representation of different aspects of this type of relationship and its varying degrees of detail.

Keywords: possessiveness; possessive meaning; multi-level language means; functional properties; pragmatic interpretation.

At present, the study of the problems of foreign languages in comparison with native languages, the comparison of their similarities and differences is becoming relevant for the study of comparative linguistics. Therefore, the identification of the distinguishing features of the category of possessiveness in linguoculturology is considered another untouched problem of comparative linguistics in the aspect of the conceptual image of the world. After all, it is known that the concept of ownership or possession in linguistics is of great importance, helping to better understand through the language the socio-cultural values of ownership, as well as the ideas of identity in various forms of linguistics.

During the development of linguistics, its aspects also developed. Moreover, instead of the structural paradigm that was relevant in the last century, a system of anthropocentric, functional, cognitive and dynamic paradigms began to function. In the anthropocentric paradigm, one can understand the shift of the researcher's interests from the object of knowledge to its subject, in other words, this can be explained as an analysis of a person in language and an analysis of language in a person.

It should be noted that the conceptual image of the world is one of the current trends in the anthropocentric paradigm of modern linguistics. It studies the relationship and influence between language and culture, explores language as a cultural phenomenon. Therefore, in the article, possessiveness and ways of expressing it are classified according to the culture of the compared languages. Possessiveness is defined as a relationship between two objects, belonging or having one to the other through linguistic means. These associations are called "owners" and the units they express are called possessive constructions. Usually a person is considered as an owner. So, in possessive relationships, one can most often understand the possession of one object or the belonging of this object to a person.

The expression of the relation of possessiveness in English is possible by language means of different levels - lexical (for example, verbs of possessive semantics have (to have), possess (to own, possess), own (to own, to have, to possess), belong (to belong, to be property), etc. n.; possessive pronouns, etc.), morphological means (construction N's + N) and syntactic means (constructions N1 of N2, N1 + N2, N1 with N2) [9]. Representing a wide range of possessive relations, they at the same time convey different components (aspects, signs, characteristics, etc.) of the object.

Thus, the verb has the broadest semantics compared to other verbs that express the possessiveness possess, own (to have, possess), belong (to be property), etc. It is paradigmatically not characterized by stylistic coloring, and, as a result, it can form various possessive meanings contextually, while the verbs own (to have, possess), possess (to own), belong (to be property) indicate a more specific nature of the relationship possession, legally fixing the belonging of the object to the subject of the possessive relationship. For example:

« —...Mark has a company car and a driver, silly,» said Una» [3, p. 16].

« Ronald Coase... showed that private entrepreneurs built, owned, and operated lighthouses, and made profits» [4, p. 199].

«... the diamond belongs to Y, with X having no further rights, or Y must return it to X and relinquish all of his rights in it» [10, p. 210].

Possessive pronouns also implement a wide range of possessive relations. However, while forming possessive meanings, they can at the same time carry the pragmatics of evaluation. The evaluative function of possessive pronouns comes down to the fact that under the influence of the contextual environment they activate the characteristic of the subject's personal attitude - positive (1) or negative (2), directing the vector of attitude towards a specific person:

(1) «—My dear Basil, how do I know?» murmured Dorian Gray...» [12, p. 147].

(2) « ...it might pain you to learn that your Teddy loved someone else» [1, p. 99].

Similar differences in modality are also observed when the relation of possessiveness is represented by structural language means. Although the constructions N's + N, N1 of N2, N1 + N2, N1 with N2 are recognized as equivalent (interchangeable) and can form the same possessive meaning without significant differences in its shades, there are a number of characteristics that distinguish these constructions from each other.

For example, the constructions N's + N and N1 + N2 clearly implement the semantics of belonging, so the possessive meaning they form is stylistically more neutral, while the constructions N1 of N2 and N1 with N2 complement the semantics of belonging with various semantic shades (descriptiveness, emotionality, evaluation, etc.), thereby giving the possessive meaning a stylistic coloring:

«They went back to Julia's flat to have a cup of tea» [6, p. 94].

«Where the Whitings' home had been was bare ground. ...The brick house of the Elsings still stood, with a new roof and a new second floor» [7, p. 546].

Thus, linguistic means of expressing possessiveness can be recognized as equivalent only from the point of view of the implementation of the general semantic constituent of possessiveness, but at the same time, it is necessary to take into account the differences in the ways of representing the meaning, due to the content specificity of each of the means. For example:

(1) « We should remember that Beethoven's death came about because he left his sister's house after a rather curious quarrel, and drove several miles in an open cart in the rain» [13, p. 83].

(2) « I found myself in a house of kindly people ...» [11, p. 115]

(3) « With the map of the city, they set out for the Quin residence» [5, p. 46].

(4) « ...Lee ponders as he sits by the coal stove in the kitchen of his neat, sturdy farmhouse» [10, p. 231].

(5) « He had two large town houses, but preferred to live in chambers...» [12, p. 47].

(6) « He had had breakfast with his mistress, whom he kept in an apartment building he owned in Lake Vista» [8, p. 79].

(7) « The estate belongs to a British national named Teabing» [2, p. 271].

In the above statements, structural (1) - (3) and lexical (4) - (7) linguistic means form the possessive meaning "property". At the same time, the shades of this meaning differ from each other in the pragmatic interpretation of the content.

In examples (5) - (6), the starting point in the pragmatic interpretation of the possessive relation is the subject of the possessive relation, expressed by the personal pronoun he (he), which extends the possession relation to the object, expressed by the nouns houses (houses) and an apartment building (furnished apartment) . The subject is an independent actant, while the object is dependent on it. As a result, the subject of a possessive relationship appears as an active or volitional owner of the object. The possessive relation here is a directed relation: the subject can be regarded as the orienting element, and the object as the orientable.

In sentences (1) - (4), the subject of the possessive relation, expressed by the nouns sister (sister), people (people), Queen (Queen) and the possessive pronoun his (his), is to some extent dependent on the object expressed by the nouns house (house), residence (house) and farmhouse (house on the farm), respectively. This entails a weakening, neutralization of the value of the activity of the subject. It is characterized in terms of its relationship with the object.

The possessive meaning formed by the constructions N's + N, N1 of N2, N1 + N2 in (3) - (5) and the possessive pronoun in (6) needs to be clarified, since a house / apartment in such situations, as a rule, means: 1) the house as a place of permanent residence or 2) the house as a temporary place of residence. At the same time, neither the construction itself nor the contextual environment indicate the legal right of ownership of the subject of a possessive relation to the object. In sentences (3) - (5) on the contrary - the object of the possessive relation, which belongs to the subject, i.e. premises, not necessarily the place of his residence. Proposition (3) is the most indicative in this regard.

The choice of one or another means for the formation of the meaning under consideration depends, as it seems to us, on the intention of the author or on the communicative task of the statement. As the language material shows, when forming the possessive meaning "property", the constructions N's + N, N1 of N2, N1 + N2 and possessive pronouns do not focus on the property right of the subject of the possessive relation to the object. Therefore, if the property rights of the subject of a possessive relationship to the object are not considered fundamentally important for the situation as a whole, the use of these constructions is more preferable. In the case of significance for the participants in communication of the subject's property rights to the object, it is preferable to use possessive semantic verbs, as, for example, in (6) and (7).

So, various linguistic means of expressing possessiveness interact in a complex way with each other, but they cannot always duplicate each other. Behind each language means there is a certain cognitive structure with its own meaningful characteristics. It is characteristic of the ways of expressing possessiveness that they all tend to expand and contract this type of relationship. At the same time, different aspects of the relation of possessiveness are represented at each of the levels, and linguistic means convey possessive relations in varying degrees of detail.

References

1. Alcott L. M. *Little Women*. L.: Penguin, 2005. 217 p.
2. Brown D. *The Da Vinci Code*. N. Y.: Doubleday, 2003. 454 p.
3. Fielding H. *Bridget Jones's Diary*. L.: Picador, 2001. 310 p.
4. Foldvary F. E., Klein D. B. *The Half-Life of Policy Rationales: How New Technology Affects Old Policy Issues // Readings in Applied Microeconomics. The Power of the Market*. L. – N. Y.: Routledge, 2009. P. 197-207.
5. Grisham J. *The Firm*. L.: Arrow Books, 490 p. 6. Maugham W. S. *Theatre*. M., 2005. 304 p.
6. Mitchell M. *Gone with the Wind*. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1991. 1024 p.
7. Sheldon S. *If Tomorrow Comes*. N. Y.: Grand Central Publishing, 2005. 416 p.

8. Taylor J. R. Possessives in English: an Exploration in Cognitive Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 368 p.
9. The American Legal System // Law, Business, and Society / ed. by T. McAdams. N. Y.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1989. P. 167-261.
10. Wells H. G. The War of the Worlds. N. Y.: Pocket Books, 2006. 264 p.
11. Wilde O. The Portrait of Dorian Gray. M., 2000. 304 p.
12. Wilson C. The Mind Parasites. M.: Raduga Publishers, 1986. 332 p.