2. Tell students to read the proverb and copy onto a separate piece of paper those words they don't understand.

3. Next to each item they have copied, students write more or less the 'sort of thing' they think the item means (they can do this in L1).

4. Only when students have finished writing their guesses may they go to the dictionary and check out the answers.

5. Verify the answers they have found in full class, and compare these with their guesses.

6. Show them how their guesses narrowed down the possibilities when they were looking up the word, thus speeding up the looking-up process and making it more likely that they would find the right word.

In conclusion we may say that proverbs are the basic textbooks and rules of the school of life. This should not be forgotten and should be used in practice. Every child should keep proverbs not only in his mind, but also in his heart. That is why it is important for us to remember proverbs and explain their essence. Using proverbs in teaching English can be one of the effective ways especially in teaching vocabulary as a proverb is usually recognized by the fixed, often short form and contains frequently used vocabulary, and therefore is quite easy to memorize.

References

1. Mieder, W. (1985). Popular views of the proverb. Proverbium, 2, 109-143

2. Neuman, S. B., & Dwyer, J. (2009).Missing in action: Vocabulary instruction in pre-k. The Reading Teacher, 62(5), 384-392.

Mastura Tadjiyeva, a head teacher
Maftuna Turayeva, Student, Termez State University, Foreign Languages Faculty

THE STRUCTURES OF EXPRESSIONS GIVING CAUSATIVE MEANING IN THE UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES
M. Tadjiyeva, M. Turayeva

Abstract: This article deals with the typological category of causativization in the material of languages of different systems and different genealogical families. In the Uzbek language grammars and in some scientific works the verbs with the forms of causativization such as "o`qitmoq" – «make/let someone read», "yozdirmoq" – «make/let someone write» are considered to be one of the forms of the category of voice (causative voice). In the English language this linguistic phenomenon is

expressed by the combination of the auxiliary verb make/let/get/cause to/ +object+infinitive: I make my student read, etc. These auxiliary verbs have lost their lexical meaning and acquired the grammatical meaning of causativization in the mentioned above patterns. In the Uzbek language the affixal morphemes - dir, - tir, - giz, etc are added to the root or the stem of the verb, at the result of which the verb acquires the meaning of causativization.

Keywords: transitivity/intransitivity, causativization/non-causativization, inflected, relative affixes, derivative affixes, root morphemes, affixal morphemes, syntagmatic and paradigmatic opposition, factitive causation, permissive causation.

1.Introduction

The aim of the article is the contrastive typological study of the linguistic phenomenon causativization in the languages of different genealogical families (Uzbek, English that is Turkic and Germanic languages). For the strict and consecutive analysis of these two languages it is desirable to work out concrete ways of description. Linguistic theory of the Moscow linguistic school concerning the form of the word founded by F.F. Fortunatov and developed by his followers M.N. Peterson, A.A. Reformatskiy, M.V. Panov and others is placed on the basis of the method for the description of languages which are both typologically and genealogically different. This method is used for the contrastive typological analysis of the structures of the Uzbek and English languages in the field of the definition of the ways of expressing the meaning of causation. Further development of this method demands the study of 1) synthetic and analytical forms; 2) the role of fusion and agglutination; 3) working out the ways of binary opposition which will serve as the standard for the definition of the means of expressing causation in the compared in this article languages. This method will be the main criteria for the analysis of the word structure in the languages of different types. V.N. Yartseva says that the structure of the word as the language unit is the measure of language structure and the structural analysis of the word proceeds from the definition of different morphemes [2, p. 111]. F.F. Fortunatov says that complex of speech sounds 1) книга "the book" is a word and complex of speech sounds 2) неправда "lie" is also a word, though the second one according to the composition, is not simple as being divided into separate words не "not" and правда "truth", loses its first lexical meaning "lie" [2, p.186].

2. Material and Methods

Considering integral character of the word F.F. Fortunatov says that the issue of the word is the issue of the system of the language [2, p. 186]. The

notion system is defined as the sum of units where every unit receives its qualitative description depended on all other units. Always where there is a system, there should be at least two units and if one of these two units is omitted the system cannot exist, that is where there is no choice of units, there is no system [4, p.8]. Systemic analysis of language structure belongs to the famous scientists B. de Kurtene, F. de Saussure , F.F. Fortunatov [3, 27]. Systemic analysis of language structure is also observed in the study of Turkic languages. The linguist Kh.G. Nigmatov used systemic method in the process of analysis of the Uzbek language [5, p. 28]. The follower of the Moscow linguistic school M.N. Peterson says that for the definition of the word structure it is reasonable to define whether it enters the binary opposition: the opposition between paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations [6, p.30]. The terms *paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations* were introduced in linguistics by Louis Hjelmslev. Method of defining the structure of the word used by M.N. Peterson is taken as a basis for the definition of the word structure of the Uzbek and English languages in this article.

3.The Methods and Approaches

The definition of the ways of expressing causal meaning in the Uzbek verbs is based on the binary opposition where non causative form of the verb is opposed to the causative form of the verb. Causative form is formulated by adding one of causative affixal morphemes - tir, - dir, - ir, -qiz, - giz, - g`iz, - qaz, - gaz, - kaz, -sat, -ar, - ir to the root or the stem of the verb. Being added to the root or the stem of the verb these affixal morphemes do not change the lexical meaning of the verb they are added to; receiving one of these affixal morphemes the verb acquires additional causal meaning, for example, the verbs with the additional causative meaning uxlatmoq, "make/let/cause someone sleep"; o„qitmoq "make/let/cause someone read" are formed from the verbs uxlamoq "to sleep", o„qimoq "to read". So the verb uxlatmoq, on the one hand is correlated with the verb o„qitmoq, on the second hand, it is opposed to the non-causative verbs uxlamoq and o„qimoq. There we have the binary opposition: paradigmatic and syntagmatic. at the result of this opposition in the causative form of the verb uxlatmoq two parts are defined: uxla - "sleep" which exist in the noncausative form uxlamoq and the part - t adds the additional shade of causation to the main part.

4.Results and Discussion

The verbs with the zero morpheme uxlaØ "sleep" (in Uzbek imperative form of the verb is expressed by the zero morpheme), o`qi "read" become non-causative forms only when they are opposed to the causative forms uxlat and o'qit. Mentioned above verbs 1) uxla "sleep" and o`qi "read" being opposed to uxladi "slept" – uxlayapti "is sleeping" – uxlaydi "will sleep"; 2)

o`qi "read" being opposed to o`qidi "read [red]" – o`qiyapti "is reading" – o`qiydi "will read" are considered to be not non-causative forms, but imperative forms of the verbs. Without mentioned oppositions we cannot speak of one or the other form either. Analysing agglutinated languages O.P. Sunik says that the structure of the word is defined only on the correlation of the definite word structure with the other forms of this word or with the other word structures of this class based on the binary opposition of the form and meaning followed by function. Only this way we can define the polysemantic feature of Turkic forms [7, 26-64 pp.].

Opposition of causative/non-causative forms of the verb o`qi o`qit o`qidi

Opposition of imperative and indicative forms of the verb.
It can be given in the following table:

	IMPERATIVE	INDICATIVE
NON-CAUSATIVE	o`qiØ "read"	o`qidi, o`qiydi- "read"/will read
	yozØ "write"	yozdi/yozadi- "write/will write"
CAUSATIVE	o`qit "make/let read"	o`qitdi/o`qitadi- "made/let read"/"will make/let read"
	yozdir "make/let write"	Yozdirdi/yozdiradi "made/let write"/"will make/let write"

5.Conclusion
Analysis of given above examples shows that imperative form of the verb correlates with the causative and indicative form of the verb depended on the position of its usage, where imperative and non-causative are formed implicitly, that is by the zero morpheme and the zero morpheme is opposed to the explicit forms of the causative and indicative forms of the verb.

Analysis of the examples selected from the Uzbek and English **References:** shows that the meaning of causation in the Uzbek language is expressed by the addition of one of special affixal morphemes to the root or the stem of the verb by agglutination in Uzbek, where non-causative verb is opposed to the causative with the same lexical meaning and by the combination of ACF with the notional verb in English, where the latter acquires some shade of causation, also being able to be opposed to the non-causative form with the same lexical meaning. Selected examples from Uzbek and English **References:** show that the linguistic phenomenon is productive in both compared languages. Causal meanings of ACF let, make, cause are so alloyed with the notional verbs and their combination with the latter is so standard and productive that is gives a chance of considering the existence of the grammatical category of causation in the structure of the English language too.

References:
1. Yartseva V.N. Definition of Morphological Types of Languages. – In the book: Morphological Typology and Problem of Language Classification. Moscow
– Leningrad, 1965 (in Russian)
2. Fortunatov F.F. Comparative Linguistics. Moscow, 1899-1900 (in Russian)
3. Fortunatov F.F. About the Voice of the Russian Verb. Moscow, 1899 (in Russian)
4. Panov M.V. Modern Russian Language. Phonetics. Moscow, 1978 (in Russian)
5. Nigmatov Kh.G. reconstructive Strategy and the Tasks of Uzbek Synchronic
Linguistics. – In the journal: Uzbek Language and **References:**. Toshkent, 1987, №
6. Peterson M.N. Modern Russian Language. Moscow, 1929 (in Russian).
7. Sunik O.P. Problems of Agglutinative Languages. – In the book: Morphological Typology and Problem of Language Classification. Moscow – Leningrad, 1965 (in Russian).