4. Казначеев Д. А., Минеева О. А. Роль проектной технологии в обучении иностранному языку // Образование и проблемы развития общества: сб. науч. ст. междунар. науч.-метод. конф. 2019. С. 13-17.

5. Ляшенко М. С., Минеева О. А., Поваренкина И. А. Использование социальных сетей как обучающей платформы в межкультурном образовании // Инновационная экономика: перспективы развития и совершенствования. 2019. № 7(41). С. 149-156.

6. Насырова Д. М., Очилова М. Р., Кодырова З. М. Проблемный метод обучения как активный метод // Наука. Мысль: электрон. период. журнал. 2014. № 4(55). С. 38-42.

7. Оладышкина А. А., Минеева О. А. Проектно-ориентированный метод обучения иностранному языку (на примере веб-квестов) // Известия Балтийской государственной академии рыбопромыслового флота. Сер.: Психолого-педагогические науки. 2017. № 4(42). С. 131-134.

8. Примерная основная образовательная программа образовательного учреждения. Основная школа / сост. Е. С. Савинов. 4-е изд., перераб. М.: Просвещение, 2011. 207 с.

9. Федеральный государственный образовательный стандарт начального общего образования: приказ М-ва образ. и науки РФ / в ред. приказов Минобрнауки России от 26.11.2010 № 1241, от 22.09.2011 № 2357.

10. Хуторской А. В. Модель компетентностного образования // Высшее образование сегодня. 2017. № 12. С 9-16.

11. Якушина Е. В. Как организовать учебные проекты с помощью Интернета // Школьные технологии. 2014. № 5. С 133-136.

A. Reymova (Nukus, Uzbekistan)
Karakalpak State University

Comparison of English and Karakalpak nouns

English and Karakalpak nouns are compared in the article. Word classes like nouns were first described by Panini. Expressions of natural language will have properties at different levels.

***Keywords*:** noun, grammar, language, definition, semantic

В статье проводится сопоставление английских и каракалпакских существительных с точки зрения их грамматических и семантических характеристик.

***Ключевые слова*:** существительные, грамматика, язык, определение, семантика

The word "noun" comes from the Latin «nomen» meaning «name». Word classes like nouns were first described by Sanskrit grammarian Panini and ancient Greeks

like Dionysios Thrax, and defined in terms of their morphological properties. For example, in Ancient Greece, nouns can be inflected for grammatical case, such as dative or accusative. Verbs, on the other hand, can be inflected for tenses, such as past, present or future, while nouns cannot. Aristotle also had a notion of onomata (nouns) and rhemata (verbs) which, however, does not exactly correspond our notions of verbs and nouns. In her dissertation, Vinokurova has a more detailed discussion of the historical origin of the notion of a noun.

Expressions of natural language will have properties at different levels. They have formal properties, like what kinds of morphological prefixes or suffixes they can take, and what kinds of other expressions they can combine with. but they also have semantic properties, i.e. properties pertaining to their meaning. The definition of nouns on the top of this page is thus a formal definition. That definition is uncontroversial, and has the advantage that it allows us to effectively distinguish nouns from non-nouns. However, it has the disadvandage that it does not apply to nouns in all languages. For example in Russian, there are no definite articles, so one cannot define nouns by means of those. There are also several attempts of defining nouns in terms of their semantic properties. Many of these are controversial, but some are discussed below [1].

In traditional school grammars, one often encounters the definition of nouns that they are all and only those expressions that refer to a person, place, thing, event, substance, quality, or idea, etc. This is a semantic definition. It has been criticized by contemporary linguists as being quite uninformative. Part of the problem is that the definition makes use of relatively general nouns ("thing," "phenomenon," "event") to define what nouns are. The existence of such general nouns shows us that nouns are organized in taxonomic hierarchies. But other kinds of expressions are also organized in hierarchies. For example all of the verbs "stroll," "saunter," "stride," and "tread" are more specific words than the more general "walk." The latter is more specific than the verb "move." But it is unlikely that such hierarchies can be used to define nouns and verbs. Furthermore, an influential theory has it that verbs like "kill" or "die" refer to events, and so they fall under the definition. Similarly, adjectives like "yellow" or "difficult" might be thought to refer to qualities, and adverbs like "outside" or "upstairs" seem to refer to places. Worse still, a trip into the woods can be referred to by the verbs "stroll" or "walk." But verbs, adjectives and adverbs are not nouns, and nouns aren't verbs. So the definition is not particularly helpful in distinguishing nouns from other parts of speech.

Another semantic definition of nouns is that they are prototypically referential. That definition is also not very helpful in distinguishing actual nouns from verbs. But it may still correctly identify a core property of nounhood. For example, we will tend to use nouns like "fool" and "car" when we wish to refer to fools and cars, respective-

ly. The notion that this is prototypocal reflects the fact that such nouns can be used, even though nothing with the corresponding property is referred to:

John is no fool.

If I had a car, I'd go to Marakech.

The first sentence above doesn't refer to any fools, nor does the second one refer to any particular car.

In most cases in treating English nouns we shall keep to the conception of scientists that we refer to post-structural tendency It's because they combine the ideas of traditional and structural grammarians. The noun is classified into a separate word-group because:

1 .they all have the same lexical - grammatical meaning :

substance / thing

2.according to their form - they've two grammatical categories:

number and case

3.they all have typical stem-building elements :

- er, - ist, - ship, - ment, -hood ....

4.typical combinability with other words:

most often left-hand combinability.

5.function - the most characteristic feature of nouns is - they can be observed in all syntactic functions but predicate.

From the grammatical point of view most important is the division of nouns into countables and un-countables with regard to the category of number and into declinables and indeclinables with regard to the category of case [2]. So after describing grammatical categories of English nouns we will try to classify them from different points of view.

Let us compare the English noun with its Karakalpak counterpart. The five properties we use as criteria for distinguishing parts of speech will serve as the basis of comparison.

1.   The lexico-grammatical meanings are similar.

2.   The variety of lexico-grammatical morphemes is much greater in the Karakalpak noun. A peculiarity of Karakalpak is the abundance of suffixes of "subjective appraisal", as in китапша, қусша, қалташа, жулдызша, қызша and etc. (Cf.-let, in booklet, streamlet, etc.).

3.   In both languages we find the categories of number and case. But their opposemes, especially those of the category of case, differ greatly in the two languages.

a)   A Karakalpak case opposeme contains six members as against the English two-member case opposeme.

b)   In English the "singular number, common case" grammeme is as a rule not marked. In Karakalpak any grammeme can be marked.

E. g. қол, әйнек, etc.

c) The productive positive number and case morphemes are standard in both compared languages.

d) Number and case are sometimes expressed by separate morphemes in English (e. g. oxen's), while in Karakalpak they are inseparable.

e) The case morpheme -'s has a certain freedom of distribution, not observed in any case morpheme of the Karakalpak language.

f) Though in both languages the meaning of case is "the relation of nouns to other words in. speech", the meaning of the possessive case is in the main narrowed to "the relation to other nouns" only, which distinguishes this case from the other cases of both Karakalpak and English.

g) Owing to the narrowness of the "possessive case", the only other case, the "common case", is exceptionally wide.

In fact, the extent of its meaning almost equals that of all the six cases of Karakalpak nouns. Hence the necessity of specification by prepositions and, consequently, the enormous importance of prepositions as a characteristic feature of English.

h) One of the prepositional phrases, the o/-phrase can practically replace the possessive case. The difference between them is mostly stylistic. There is nothing similar in Karakalpak.

4. In both languages nouns can be divided into countables and uncountables, the latter — into singularia tantum and pluralia tantum. In both languages uncountables have oblique 'number' meanings through the analogy in form and combinability with countables. But in the Karakalpak language there is nearly always correlation between form and combinability which is not the case in English (the cattle are, physics is, the. family is or are).

5. The number of Karakalpak nouns having no case opposites is small. They are comparatively recent borrowings like пальто, депо, такси, кенгуру, etc. In English the majority of nouns have no case opposites.

6. In both languages the functions of different case grammemes are different. In Karakalpak only a nominative case grammeme can be the subject, only an accusative case grammeme can be a direct object, only a nominative or an instrumental case grammeme is used as a predicative.

In English possessive case grammemes are used almost exclusively as attributes. Common case grammemes fulfill the functions of almost any part of the sentence.

References

1. Blokh M. Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. M., 1983. 383 с.

2. Каушанская В. Л. и др. Грамматика английского языка (на английском языке). М., 1973. С. 22.