Comparison of semantic aspects of pronouns in English, Russian and Uzbek languages

Sariyeva Zamira Ravilevna
Teacher at English language teaching methodology department
TerSU

Abstract

As the student of foreign philology, I have learned different languages Uzbek, Russian, English and French. All of these languages are different and study them in connection with each other was not easy. In my opinion, the person who calls himself / herself as a linguist should know at least four languages. Each person chooses which foreign language to learn according interests of that person, but one who knows only one language cannot call himself as a linguist because he does not know his subject at all. By learning languages we also learn to compare them with each other, but this comparison does not mean to choose which one is the best and which one is the worst, however it cannot be said to the languages. All languages in the world are beautiful and unique by their nature. The topic of my research is “Comparison of semantic aspects and their syntactic of pronouns in English, Russian and Uzbek languages”. In my work I will try to make comparison of these languages according to their grammatical features in the sentences. All of these languages differ from each other dramatically and that was one of the reasons for their interest. Comparing the languages with each other, in order to find their similarities and explain differences. The linguist is the person, who analyze language or languages, try to get more familiar with all aspects of that or those languages.

In Uzbek and Russian languages unlike English the noun changes its structure if it changes its role in the sentence, change from subject to the object for example: Russian sentences with the same noun “the book”, in the first sentences this noun comes as a subject of the sentences and as an object in the second. For example:

Книга на столе /kniga na stɔle/

‘The book is on the table’.

Он взял книгу. /ɔn vzjal knigu/

‘He took the book’.

Here the noun “book” — “книга” changes its structure by adding an affix “у” as this noun changes its role in the sentence. Here, in the first sentence this word is the subject of the sentence so it is used in the nominative case and in nominative case in Russian language there is no affixation so the word “книга” is used in the dictionary form. In the next sentence this word is used in accusative case. So the noun book “книга” have the case forms:

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	Книга	Книги book books
Genitive	Книги	Книг book books
Dative	Книге	Книгам to a book to books
Accusative	Книгу	Книги book book
Instrumental	Книгой	Книгами with a book with books

Prepositional	Книге	Книгах on,in, by... book/s

As compare these three languages, we can see the differences in this table:

number	Uzbek	English	Russian
1	Kitobstolningustida.	The book is on the table.	Книгана столе /kniga na stɔle/
2	U kitobnioldi.	He took the book.	Он взял книгу /ɔnvzjalknigu/

As we can see in this table, examples in English language:

The book is on the table.

He took the book.

Here we can see that the noun “book” which is used as a subject in the first sentence and as an object in the second one. It does not have any affixation and have the same form in both sentences.

Now, let’s see the same sentences in Uzbek language.

Kitob stolning ustida.

book table on

‘The book is on the table’

U kitobni oldi.

he book took.

‘He took the book’

Here, we can see that in the first sentence the noun “kitob” (book) is used in the nominative case and have no affixation. In the second sentence the noun is used in the accusative form (tushum kelishigi) and have an affixation “-ni” the specific affixation of the accusative case.

As for English examples of these sentences:

The book is on the table.

He took the book.

Here, we can see that both of the nouns are in the same form, although they have been used in different roles in the sentences. In the first sentence the noun is used as a subject and in the second as an object.

Pronouns in these languages have got their own implementation, their usage and additional meaning. Let’s consider this on the basis of interrogative pronouns.

Interrogative pronoun “what” in Russian language

In Russian language interrogative pronoun “what?” is expressed by “что?” (čto). The Russian interrogative pronoun čto was a content word that connoted the meaning ’request for information regarding unknown facts’, but from a certain time onward, it also came to play the role of function word involving ’conjunction’ and ’comparison’. Let’s look at the following three examples.

(1).Čto bylo dal’še?

What happened next?

(Karelin, Ja verju v goroskopy (I believe in horoscope).

(2). Sergievskij. Mne ona predskazala, čto ja stanu deduškoj.

She foretold me to become a grandfather. (Kočetkov, Tol'kozatem (Only

then).

(3). Aleksandr L'vovič. ...a vy nam čto rodnoj syn?!

Are you our blood son?! (Šiškin, Vsex ožidaet odna noč.

(One Night Befalls Us All).

This discussion presents analysis of semantic and syntactic aspects of interrogative pronoun "what". The čto in the first sample sentence is a content word that has a detailed propositional content. It is also an interrogative pronoun which acts as the subject of the sentence, requires a case on the syntactic level, directly participates in the composition of the interrogative utterance, and is given the stress in the sentence. The čto in the second sample sentence is a conjunction that materializes the contents of the main clause when connecting the main clause and the subordinate clause in the subordinate complex sentence. The čto in the third sample sentence helps the connection between the subject 'vy nam' and the predicate 'rodnoj syn', and is also a comparative particle that emphasizes the meaning of the subject through comparison. The čto in the second and third sample sentences are conjunctions and particles that are function words that do not have detailed propositional content, cannot become sentence components, do not undergo declension, and do not receive a stress in the sentence. The above three sample sentences show that čto is a homonym.

The debate over whether čto is a homonym or a polysemy is still ongoing. However, Russian dictionaries establish homonyms as different entries so that they are described like n^1, n^2, n^3, ..., n^n. Čto is also described like čto- čto¹, čto², ... čto^n, the fact which that belongs to the different speech part levels of interrogative pronoun, conjunction, and comparative particle, and the reason čto has become a multiple speech part word is due to a grammaticalization phenomenon. Even if interrogative pronoun čto acquires the status of conjunction and comparative particle due to the grammaticalization phenomenon, the three morphemes of interrogative pronoun, conjunction, and comparative particle perform their respective roles while coexisting at the same period.

However, although the transference phenomenon of interrogative pronoun čto to conjunction is recognized by all, because there is still controversy surrounding the transference of conjunction of čto to comparative particle, a more detailed and clearer research seems to be necessary. Based on this criticism, the paper will also analyze the speech part transference phenomenon of conjunction čto to comparative particle, from the viewpoint of grammaticalization. Existing reveals that most Russian linguists recognize čto as a homonym.

The speech part transference of interrogative pronoun čto has unfolded in two directions. The first direction is transference from interrogative pronoun to interrogative particle, while the second direction is from interrogative pronoun to conjunction and comparative particle. The particle of the first and second direction belong to the same speech part level, but its function and meaning are different, which make it a different word. To emphasize this point, the čto that adds a nuance of interrogation to the utterance in the interrogative sentence will be designated as an interrogative pronoun, while the čto emphasizing the meaning of comparison in the simple sentence, designated as comparative particle. In sample sentences

(4). Sledovatel '.Čto, zakem?

(Judge: What, whom?) (Karelin)

(5). Den'gi čto voda

(Money is like water)(proverb)

The čto in the first sample sentence is an interrogative pronoun and the čto in the second sample sentence is a comparative particle. However, due to space restrictions, the paper will limit the discussion to the speech part transference related to the second direction.

The phenomenon of grammaticalization dividing into several parts, that is, when a single grammatical form forms one or more grammaticalization chain, this is referred to as poly grammaticalization. According to the chain, grammaticalization forms a line, and this line does not need to be in a single line structure, and may form a complex structure in which several lines diverge(Eom, Soon-Cheon :145,146).

Conclusion.

Pronouns are usually used to replace nouns but it does not mean that they do not express their own meaning. The examples that are given on Russian interrogative pronoun “what” denote how many meanings pronoun can express. from above mentioned special question sentences, that were given as the examples for the arguments, we can conclude that semantic differences among interrogative sentences, and especially in usage of interrogative pronouns happen because of the asymmetry in the process of translation. From above mentioned examples it is obvious that, the reason of this asymmetry is the difference in perception of the speakers of that particular language.

Differences in translation from one language to another (in most cases difference is in semantic aspect) is usually caused by mentality and culture of the speakers of that particular language. As culture and mentality of the speakers make influence on the language that is spoken by those people. Because their attitude toward everything about the life.

Reference:

1. Gak.V.G (1977) “COMPARATIVE LEXICOLOGY (On a material French and Russian languages) “International Relations” Moscow.

2. Eom, Soon-Cheon "The Analysis of the Process of Russian Conjunction Čto becomingComparative Particle"(DongGuk University)

3. Houk, N. (1991). Tag questions: A necessary pragmatic context. In L. Bouton & Y. KachruPragmatics and language learning: Monograph series vol. 2

4.Kasymova N.F (2011) "Asymmetry in translation of interrogative sentences with questionword ’WHAT’ (based on the English, Russian and Uzbek languages). Bulletin of theChelyabinsk State University. № 11 (226)