

Expressing the category of uncertainty through Nominal category and Case category of nouns in English and Uzbek languages.

Klicheva Nargiza Ashirbayevna

Lecturer, Department of Interfaculty Foreign Languages, Urgench State University of science and innovations.

Abstract: This article delves into the nuanced expression of uncertainty within the English and Russian languages through the examination of nominal and case categories of nouns. Uncertainty, a multifaceted concept, is essential in human communication, influencing linguistic structures to convey degrees of doubt, ambiguity, and probability. Through a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek, both renowned for their rich grammatical systems, this study explores how nominal morphology and case inflection contribute to the articulation of uncertainty.

The article analysis the syntactic and semantic mechanisms employed in each language to represent uncertainty. In English, where nominal morphology is relatively straightforward compared to Uzbek, uncertainty often relies on lexical ambiguity, contextual cues, and syntactic structures. Conversely, Uzbek, with its intricate case system, offers a diverse array of tools for expressing uncertainty through noun declension. The analysis encompasses the role of specific cases such as the genitive, instrumental, and accusative in conveying different shades of uncertainty.

Furthermore, the study investigates cultural and pragmatic factors that influence the expression of uncertainty in each language. Cultural norms and communicative styles shape linguistic choices, impacting how uncertainty is articulated and interpreted within English and Uzbek discourse. By shedding light on how uncertainty is encoded linguistically, this research enhances our understanding of cross-linguistic variations in expressing abstract concepts. It contributes to the broader discourse on linguistic relativity and cognition, highlighting the intricate interplay between language, culture, and cognition in shaping human expression.

Keywords: lexico-grammatical categories of words, parts of speech, definition, classification, case, number, person, morphologization, lexicalization, noun, suppletive forms.

Introduction:

Uncertainty, a fundamental aspect of human experience, permeates all facets of communication, challenging individuals to articulate doubt, ambiguity, and probability effectively. Languages serve as intricate systems for expressing such abstract concepts, relying on various linguistic features to convey shades of uncertainty. In this study, we embark on an exploration of how uncertainty is expressed in two linguistically distinct languages: English and Uzbek. Specifically, we delve into the role of nominal morphology and case inflection in English and

Uzbek nouns, seeking to unravel the intricate mechanisms through which uncertainty is encoded and navigated within these linguistic systems.

English and Uzbek represent two diverse linguistic landscapes, each with its unique grammatical structures, cultural nuances, and communicative norms. While English is renowned for its analytic nature and relatively simplified nominal morphology, Uzbek boasts a rich agglutinative morphology and a complex system of nominal case marking. These linguistic differences offer a fascinating lens through which to examine the expression of uncertainty, shedding light on how linguistic structures reflect and shape cognitive processes related to uncertainty perception and communication.

The study aims to address several key questions: How do English and Uzbek languages encode uncertainty through their nominal and case categories? What linguistic strategies do speakers employ to convey varying degrees of uncertainty? How do cultural and pragmatic factors influence the expression of uncertainty in each language? By answering these questions, we seek to deepen our understanding of the intricate relationship between language, cognition, and culture in the representation of abstract concepts such as uncertainty. This article holds both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it contributes to the growing body of research on linguistic relativity, exploring how linguistic structures shape our conceptualization and expression of uncertainty. Practically, the findings of this study may have implications for language teaching, cross-cultural communication, and natural language processing, providing insights into the nuances of uncertainty expression that can enhance language learning and communication in diverse contexts.

In the subsequent sections, we will delve into a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek, examining the ways in which nominal morphology and case inflection contribute to the expression of uncertainty in each language. Through this comparative lens, we aim to elucidate the intricate interplay between linguistic structure, cultural context, and cognitive processes in navigating uncertainty within linguistic communication.

Classification and comparison of Nominal categories of nouns in Uzbek and English languages:

Number is an inflectional grammatical category that conveys the opposition of singularity and more than singularity objects designated by linguistic signs. In the first case, the word forms are singular forms, in the second - plural. The category of number is presented in Uzbek and English, but not to the same extent. From English nominal parts of speech the characteristic only of nouns. Pronouns have a purely grammatical category of number is actualized only in the oppositions yourself - yourselves and other - others.

Question about the nature of the number of demonstrative pronouns this (these) and that (those) is highly controversial. In Uzbek, nouns have the category of number, adjectives, ordinal numbers, pronouns of all categories. From non-nominal parts of speech the category of number presented in verbs. Since the meaningful functions of numbers, which are based on function of quantitative actualization, concerns only

nouns (S.D. Katsnelson, 1972, p.28), we will focus all our attention on the category they have the numbers.

The main way to form plural forms is nouns in English are external inflection, sometimes accompanied by changes root consonants:

English: *knife - knives*

Uzbek: *do`st-do`stlar*

In English there are several nouns, forms the plural of which retains remnants of Anglo-Saxon palatal reversal. This is a forming method called internal inflection. Compare: *goose-geese, foot-feet*, etc.

Another feature of the English language that is not characteristic of Uzbek language is the borrowed nouns from other languages together with foreign language plural inflection. Compare: *antenna-antenna, datum-data, phenomenon - phenomena*, etc.

There is still a noticeable tendency towards gradual the displacement of foreign language inflection by native inflection - s. Compare: *antenna-antennas, medium-mediums* along with *antenna and media*, respectively. As for Uzbek morphology, plural forms of borrowed nouns have inflections by native inflection -lar. here, ending with some vowels. These are words like “*kengurular*”, “*pancholar*”, “*kolibrilar*”.

In English, there are no plural inflections. quite a few are even native Germanic nouns. Wed: *deer, sheep, swine*, as well as *trout, snipe*, etc.

In Uzbek, as the category of number of nouns represents a complex subject-semantic knot in which various grammatical and Lexico-semantic features of nouns. In a relationship English language such a remark, I think, will be even more fair than in relation to the Uzbek.

Contentful functions of number forms in comparable Uzbek and English languages are very diverse and complex. Here first of all It should be borne in mind that number forms do not always express meaning singularity and multiplicity. Such meanings are inherent in them when We are talking about the names of single, discrete objects, i.e. those items which are subject to counting.

Ex: Uzbek “*xontahta*” - “*xontahtalar*” // English. *day - days*, etc.

There are also very numerous cases when the number forms are not perform the functions of quantitative actualization. This is typical before total for nouns that are used only in the singular or only in the plural.

In the languages being compared, singular noun is divided according to its meaning into the following three groups:

1) Nouns with real meaning:

English *milk* //Uzbek “*sut*”;

sugar // “*shakar*”.

2) Nouns with collective meanings:

English *community* // Uzbek “*jamoat*”;

mankind // “*insoniyat*”;

foliage // “*yashillik*”.

3) Nouns expressing abstract concepts:

English *hatred*// Uzbek “*nafrat*”;

peace // “tinçlik”;
health // “sog`lik”.

Correlative plural nouns in comparable Uzbek and In English there are nouns that mean:

1) Items consisting of two (paired items) or several parts:

English`trousers // Uzbek shimlar;

“qaychilar” //scissors ;

“kishanlar” // fetters;

"paypoqlar" // socks.

Plural collection, collection of something:

Uzbek "memuarlar". // English memoirs;

“Ta`minotlar” // virtuals.

4) Substances, materials, as well as their remains:

Uzbek "tuzlamalar" // English preserves;

“chiqindilar” // slops.

Plural noun is also denoted in comparable languages for action and processes. However, lexical correspondences between nouns of this type is not noted in Russian and English:

Uzbek “amallar” // English. goings-on;

“sud jarayonlari” // proceedings.

The last feature, of course, does not exhaust the differences between nouns pluralia tantum of the languages in question. There are also more significant differences:

1) Nouns pluralia tantum in English are significant more than in Uzbek.

2) Distribution of correlative nouns by singularity and plurality does not coincide. So, in Uzbek pluralia tantum “pullar”, “shaxmatlar”, “hamurturushlar” correspond to the English singularia tantum money, chess, yeast and, conversely, English pluralia tantum clothes, greens, sweepings correspond to Uzbek singularia tantum “kiyim-keçak”, “o`t-ulan”, “ahlat”. Correlative with Uzbek pluralia tantum “darvozalar”, “xaskashlar”, “chanalar” English nouns are used in both numbers: gate-gates, rakerakes, sledge-sledges.

It is necessary to focus on one very important feature singularia tantum. Nouns belonging to this category are such only in their basic meaning. In derivatives meanings, quite a few of them can take the form of numbers. Real singularia tantum, which denote objects, deprived of the sign of discreteness, in the plural, deprived functions of quantitative actualization: English. *the delicate wines he had swilled without tasting them (Wain)* -Uzbek. "sharop" or: Uzbek "suv-suvlar" (ocean) // English water-waters.

As you can see, there are certain semantic shifts here, which serves as a basis to talk about lexicalization of plural forms or grammatical morpheme - s.

In addition, in English a number of real nouns in forms, numbers can denote objects made from a given substance:

an iron (pi. irons) - “dazmol”, a copper (pi. coppers) - “mis tanga”.

Abstract singularia tantum takes the form of a number when designation of individual cases or aspects of a particular or other phenomenon. ex:

Uzbek “bolalik quvonchi” - English. the joys of childHood.

For the English language this phenomenon is obviously more typical. So, Uzbek analogues of words highlighted in the following examples are not used in plural:

They literally know nothing of the *injustices* they've perpetrated ... the English government's *policies* let directly to the potato famine... (Wain). Three: Loves (Cronin).

It is possible to use abstract nouns in number form to designate the person who bears the characteristic they express: "go`zallik" -

beauty // "go`zal" - a beauty.

Ex: *The girl behind the reception desk was a classic Welsh beauty* (Wain).

So, the specifics of the category of number of English nouns (in background of comparisons with correlative data of the Russian language) are the following features:

1) A whole series of words with inflection - s are nouns only singular (news, measles, summons) or both (the number of such nouns is indicated by the forms predicates or personal pronouns that agree with them).

Ex: No news is good news (Proverb). Most of the children here have had measles. Those that haven't are sure to get it sooner or later (Cronin).

Ex: The headquarters of my unit has already with-drawn (Crichton). I don't care what your politics are (Brain).

2) A significant number of collective nouns, not having correlative plural forms are plural nouns (cattle, police, gentry, etc.) or are combined with predicates mainly in the plural (poultry, etc.).

3) Many collective nouns in singular form numbers express the meaning of singularity or plurality depending on depends on whether the denotations of these nouns are characterized by discreteness or is not inherent.

Ex:

"Is this party for you?" Sarie asked impersonally (Abrahams).

Ex.:

Gerald Twyfold's party were dining fashionably late (Wain).

4) Some nouns have two plural forms numbers with different meanings:

"brothers" // brother - brothers and "brethren,

hamkasablar" // brethren;

"daholar" // genius - geniuses

"ruhlar" // genii.

5) Nouns denoting units of measurement, are used in the singular to indicate plurality, if they are preceded by certain quantifiers:

A bag of 30 brace of birds.

Two yoke of oxen.

He could do better than twenty stone.

Six head of cattle.

Finally, it is worth making a few more comments regarding the lexicalization of forms already mentioned above plural.

In English, this process has probably started somewhat further than in Uzbek. This is evidenced by the presence in it such words as colours - "bayroq", customs - "bojhona to`lovlari", pains - "harakatlar", etc. They are semantically so isolated from colors - "ranglar"), customs (plural of custom "urf-odat"), pains (plural of pain -

“og`riq”), which are correlative words it would be correct to consider them as homonyms.

As for the Uzbek language, the lexicalization of plural forms the numbers in it obviously reach their greatest extent in such correlative words like “kirlar”, “ suvlar(shifobaxsh)” etc.

Classification and comparison of Case categories of nouns in Uzbek and English languages:

Case is an inflectional noun category that expresses the relationship of an object denoted by the dependent form of a name to another object, action, state, etc., denoted by the dominant in a word.

Between the Uzbek language, on the one hand, and English, on the other, in There are significant differences in the area of the case category. In Uzbek, all nouns are declined, with the exception of

those who, being of foreign language origin, do not accept inflection in plural. In English, only nouns and some pronoun ranks (personal, interrogative and conjunction who, mutual complex indefinite, negative and generalizing with the second element - one and - body and indefinite personal one).

The case paradigm of inflected words is in English: the language from only two forms. For nouns and pronouns (except personal) there is a distinction between common and possessive case, also called

genitive (possessive, genitive).

Personal pronouns have cases called nominative and objective. The exception is the pronoun, who -the only word in the English language whose case paradigm is includes three forms: who - nominative case, whose -possessive (parental) and whom - objective.

In Uzbek they are declined, except for nouns and pronouns (not all), adjectives and numerals. The case paradigm consists of six forms.

In English it is customary to distinguish between dependent and independent parent case.

In the first case, it is always part of noun phrases in as an adjunct, for example:

my sister's bag. .

In the second case, the case form is used absolutely. Ex:

Well, that was Gareth's problem. Roger's was to get some lunch (Wain). Is he a friend of Daddy's (id.).

The semantic functions of the dependent genitive are reduced to expression of the following relations according to the expressed content:

1) accessories: Gareth's bus;

2) the whole to the part: the old man's eyes, the water's edge;

3) subjective focus on the determined: Eden's decision, Hugh's visit(Snow);

4) object-oriented towards what is being determined (relatively rare):

They seemed to be laid down in black and white, that evening after George's trial (Snow);

- 5) personal and public relations: my sister's friend;
- 6) quality: in some special women's clinics. What a dog's life (Wain);

7) measures (for words with the meaning of time, distance, weight, cost . a six weeks' tour, a two miles' walk, several shilling's worth.

Since the case in question expresses (except for the meaning belonging) a whole range of other meanings, it seems to us more it is correct to call it genitive. In Uzbek, the expression of the first three and fifth semantic

relationships are also achieved by non-prepositional forms of the genitive case.

Compare: “Garetning avtobusi”, “qariyaning ko`zlar”, “Idening qarori”, “singlimning dugonasi”, etc.).

To express other relations, case forms are used with prepositions and adjectives:

To express other relations, case forms are used with prepositions and adjectives:

English George's trial // Uzbek: "Jorjga aloqador sud jarayonlari";

English in some special women's clinics // Russian. " ayollar uchun ba`zi klinikalar";

English a six weeks'tour , Uzbek: "olti kunlik sayyohat" etc.

In English, the scope of use of the genitive case lexically limited. However, it should not be taken literally found in popular English grammar textbooks the statement that only objects are used in this case, and some others (more or less specific semantics), denoting inanimate objects. The facts of language indicate that nouns denoting inanimate objects, do not lend themselves in any way a certain semantic classification.

Thus, in the language of D. Sommerfield's novel “The Inheritance” in the genitive case there are the following nouns expressing inanimate objects and concepts: street, room, kettle, bed, music, floor, face, voice, water, fate, business, tank, engine, train, wall, gasworks.

In light of the above, the assumption of A.I. Smirnitsky (1959,p.126) that the genitive case “is fundamentally possible for everyone nouns” seems quite convincing to us.

To form the genitive case forms of nouns in singular and plural [in the latter case, those few the number paradigm of which contains forms without - (e)s] is used one and the same the same element is 's: man's - men's, child's - children's.

Often the morpheme - 's is attached to a whole phrase, in as a result of which quite a significant distance from it is possible inflected component: Well, she is with somebody else's party (Wain). I never knew the woman who laced so tightly's name was Matheson (Forster).

Unlike the dependent, which is part of the nominal phrases, the genitive independent can also be included in as an adjunct in verb phrases:

It was that pain, added to George's, which led me into an error in legal tactics (Snow).

He wanted to leave the town, find a firm similar to Eden's.... (id.).

Observations show that a special case of absolute the use of the genitive case is its functioning in local meaning:

I stayed at Mrs.Reed's (Snow). "Let's go up to Lord's" (J. Galsworthy).

The source of such forms remains unclear. What concerns the -'s function in similar cases, then even some proponents cases are refused to be recognized in English nouns consider it here as a case inflection.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study offers valuable insights into the ways in which English and Uzbek languages express the category of uncertainty through nominal and case categories of nouns. By examining linguistic structures within their cultural and cognitive contexts, we deepen our understanding of how languages reflect and shape human perception, cognition, and communication. In this article, we have undertaken a comparative analysis of how uncertainty is expressed through nominal and case categories of nouns in English and Uzbek languages. Through this exploration, we have unraveled the intricate ways in which linguistic structures reflect and shape the expression of uncertainty within these two diverse linguistic systems.

References:

1. Austin J.L. How To Do Things With Words. — Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005. - 258 p.
2. Barthes, Roland. Elements of semiology. — New York: Hill and Wang, 2007. - 124 p.
3. Bates E. Language and Context: the Acquisition of Pragmatics. - New York: Academic Press, 2006. - 448 p.
4. Bean S. Symbolic and Pragmatic Semantics. - Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008. - 470 p.
5. Bolinger D. Meaning and Form. - London: Longman, 2007. - 312 p.
6. Bushuy A.M. Canonical Forms of Words (Some Remarks on Typology of Languages) // Tillarni kiyosiy - typologist 5fganishning dolzarb muammolari. - Termiz: Termiz Davlat University, 2004. - pp. 66-67.
7. Bushuy A., Rahhimov G. Primal Character of Spoken Language // Compiled Articles of the Istedod Foundation of the President of the RU. - New Delhi [India: CMC Ltd.], 2006. - P. 13-15.
8. Bushuy, Tatyana. Umumiy tilshunoslik. - Samarqand: SDChTI, 2002. 50 b.
9. Bushuy T.A. Tilda "statika" va "dinamika" tushunchalari // Tilshunoslikning nazariy va amaliy masalalari. (Ikkinchi chikish). - Samarkand: SamDChTI, 2003. - 11-17 b.
10. Bushuy T, Tilning ijtimoiy hodisa sifatida o'ziga xos xususiyatlari // Masalalari Philology. - Tashkent, 2003. - No. 2. — 14 b.