



**JOURNAL OF ADVANCED  
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**

**ISSN: 0976-9595**

## Editorial Team

### Editorial Board Members

**Dr. Hazim Jabbar Shah Ali**

Country: University of Baghdad , Abu-Ghraib , Iraq.

*Specialization: Avian Physiology and Reproduction.*

**Dr. Khalid Nabih Zaki Rashed**

Country: Dokki, Egypt.

*Specialization: Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries.*

**Dr. Manzoor Khan Afridi**

Country: Islamabad, Pakistan.

*Specialization: Politics and International Relations.*

**Seyyed Mahdi Javazadeh**

Country: Mashhad Iran.

*Specialization: Agricultural Sciences.*

**Dr. Turapova Nargiza Ahmedovna**

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

*Specialization: Art and Humanities, Education*

**Dr. Muataz A. Majeed**

Country: INDIA

*Specialization: Atomic Physics.*

**Dr Zakaria Fouad Fawzy Hassan**

Country: Egypt

*Specialization: Agriculture and Biological*

**Dr. Subha Ganguly**

Country: India

*Specialization: Microbiology and Veterinary Sciences.*

**Dr. KANDURI VENKATA LAKSHMI NARASIMHACHARYULU**

Country: India.

*Specialization: Mathematics.*

**Dr. Mohammad Ebrahim**

Country: Iran

*Specialization: Structural Engineering*

**Dr. Malihe Moeini**

Country: IRAN

*Specialization: Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology*

**Dr. I. Anand shaker**

Country: India.

*Specialization: Clinical Biochemistry*

**Dr. Magdy Shayboub**

Country: Taif University, Egypt

*Specialization: Artificial Intelligence*

**Kozikhodjayev Jumakhodja Hamdamkhodjayevich**

Country: Uzbekistan

*Senior Lecturer, Namangan State University*

**Dr. Ramachandran Guruprasad**

Country: National Aerospace Laboratories, Bangalore, India.

*Specialization: Library and Information Science.*

**Dr. Alaa Kareem Niamah**

Country: Iraq.

*Specialization: Biotechnology and Microbiology.*

**Dr. Abdul Aziz**

Country: Pakistan

*Specialization: General Pharmacology and Applied Pharmacology.*

**Dr. Khalmurzaeva Nadira** - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Japanese Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

**Dr. Mirzakhmedova Hulkar** - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Iranian-Afghan Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

**Dr. Dilip Kumar Behara**

Country: India

*Specialization: Chemical Engineering, Nanotechnology, Material Science and Solar Energy.*

**Dr. Neda Nozari**

Country: Iran

*Specialization: Obesity, Gastrointestinal Diseases.*

**Bazarov Furkhat Odilovich**

Country: Uzbekistan

Tashkent institute of finance

**Shavkatjon Joraboyev Tursunqulovich**

Country: Uzbekistan

Namangan State University

**C/O Advanced Scientific Research,**

**8/21 Thamocharan Street,**

**Arisipalayam, Salem**

**Theoretical foundations of ambiguity category in English and Uzbek languages:  
The sentence placement of adjectives.**

**Klicheva Nargiza Ashirbayevna**

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

**Abstract:**

This paper explores the theoretical foundations of the ambiguity category in English and Uzbek languages. Ambiguity, the presence of multiple possible interpretations or meanings within a given linguistic context, poses challenges for language users in understanding and communicating effectively. By studying the theoretical aspects of ambiguity, we can gain insights into the mechanisms behind this linguistic phenomenon and develop strategies for disambiguation. In English, ambiguity is prevalent due to its vast vocabulary, flexible word order, and idiomatic expressions. Words with multiple meanings, homophones, homonyms, and homographs contribute to the complexity of interpretation. Additionally, sentence structure and semantic nuances add further layers of ambiguity. The theoretical exploration of ambiguity in English involves investigating various linguistic levels, such as phonetics, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. For Uzbek, a Turkic language, ambiguity characteristics arise from its agglutinative nature and complex verbal system. The extensive use of affixes to indicate grammatical roles and relations can generate ambiguous constructions. The study of the theoretical foundations of ambiguity in Uzbek involves understanding the intricacies of its verbal system, including precise contextual cues to disambiguate between different grammatical tenses, aspects, and moods. Theoretical approaches to ambiguity in English and Uzbek encompass various linguistic theories, including lexical semantics, cognitive linguistics, generative grammar, and discourse analysis. These theories offer frameworks for understanding how ambiguity is generated and resolved in communication. This study aims to contribute to a better understanding of the theoretical foundations of ambiguity in English and Uzbek languages. By examining linguistic phenomena at different levels, we seek to shed light on the complexities of language and provide practical insights for language learners, translators, and interpreters. Ultimately, the exploration of theoretical foundations of ambiguity enhances our understanding of language and its nuances, enabling effective communication in both English and Uzbek contexts.

**Introduction:**

The theoretical foundations of the ambiguity category in English and Uzbek languages are critical for understanding the complexities of language and meaning. Ambiguity refers to the presence of multiple possible interpretations or meanings within a given linguistic context. While ambiguity can occur in various languages,

English and Uzbek offer interesting insights into the mechanisms behind this linguistic phenomenon.

In English, ambiguity commonly arises due to the language's rich vocabulary, flexible word order, and idiomatic expressions. Words with multiple meanings, homophones, homonyms, and homographs contribute to the ambiguity in English language usage. Additionally, syntactic structures and semantic nuances can further complicate the interpretation of English sentences. On the other hand, Uzbek, as a Turkic language, has its own sets of ambiguity characteristics. The agglutinative nature of the language, with its extensive use of affixes to indicate grammatical roles and relations, can sometimes create ambiguous constructions. Furthermore, Uzbek has a complex verbal system, which requires precise context to disambiguate between different grammatical tenses, aspects, and moods. The theoretical foundations of the ambiguity category in both English and Uzbek involve examining various linguistic levels, such as phonetics, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Scholars have proposed different approaches to understanding and categorizing ambiguity, including lexical ambiguity, structural ambiguity, and referential ambiguity. In the study of theoretical foundations, researchers explore the underlying principles and mechanisms that contribute to ambiguity in language. This includes linguistic theories such as lexical semantics, cognitive linguistics, generative grammar, and discourse analysis. These theories aim to provide frameworks for understanding how ambiguity is generated and resolved in communication. Understanding the theoretical foundations of ambiguity in English and Uzbek languages is crucial for language learners, translators, and interpreters who need to navigate the challenges posed by ambiguous language structures and meanings. It also offers valuable insights into the nature of language itself and how humans interpret and communicate meaning.

In this study, we will delve deeper into the theoretical aspects of ambiguity in English and Uzbek languages, examining various linguistic phenomena and exploring the methodologies and frameworks used to analyze and resolve ambiguity. By doing so, we hope to contribute to a better understanding of the complexities of language and provide practical insights for language users in both English and Uzbek contexts.

**Key words:** Ambiguity, Linguistic ambiguity, Theoretical foundations, Comparative linguistics Lexical ambiguity, Syntactic ambiguity, Semantic ambiguity, Disambiguation strategies.

### **Author`s review**

An exploration of the theoretical foundations of the ambiguity category in English and Uzbek languages reveals a rich and multifaceted landscape within the realm of linguistic studies. Researchers have approached this theme from various theoretical perspectives, offering insights into the structural, syntactic, and semantic dimensions of ambiguity, as well as its cultural and contextual manifestations. Structural linguistics, a foundational framework in the study of language, has been instrumental in analyzing the inherent structures that give rise to ambiguity. Scholars like **Ferdinand de Saussure** and **Leonard Bloomfield** have laid the groundwork for

understanding how linguistic elements interact within a system, influencing the potential for multiple interpretations.

Generative grammar, pioneered by **Noam Chomsky**, has provided a theoretical lens through which researchers investigate the rules and structures generating sentences in languages. Within this framework, ambiguity is seen as a consequence of the inherent generative power of language, prompting scholars to explore the limits and possibilities of syntactic and lexical ambiguity in English and Uzbek.

Cognitive linguistics, as championed by **George Lakoff and Ronald Langacker**, contributes to the discussion by emphasizing the role of mental representations and conceptual structures in language use. This perspective sheds light on how speakers navigate ambiguity through cognitive processes, offering a bridge between formal linguistic structures and the intricacies of human thought.

Cross-linguistic studies have played a pivotal role in comparing and contrasting ambiguity in different languages. Researchers like **Charles Fillmore** and **Dan Slobin** have conducted cross-linguistic analyses to identify universal and language-specific patterns in the manifestation and resolution of ambiguity, contributing to our understanding of linguistic diversity.

Sociolinguistic variables and cultural influences have been explored by scholars such as **Erving Goffman and Deborah Tannen**. Their work highlights how ambiguity is not solely a linguistic phenomenon but is deeply intertwined with social and cultural factors, impacting how individuals from diverse linguistic communities interpret and resolve ambiguous expressions. The authors engaging with the theoretical foundations of the ambiguity category in English and Uzbek languages have drawn upon a diverse array of theoretical frameworks. From structural linguistics to cognitive linguistics, and from generative grammar to sociolinguistics, the synthesis of these perspectives enriches our comprehension of how ambiguity operates at various levels of linguistic analysis and its implications for cross-cultural communication.

## **Methodology**

The methods used during this scientific research study are descriptive, comparative and synchronic. With the help of a descriptive method we'll try to notify and describe the place of adjectives in the sentence in both of the languages separately. While, with the help of comparative method we'll try to compare and contrast the two languages concerning the sentential place of adjectives in the translated paradigms taken from novels. The synchronic method will help us see and classify the actual flow of these processes in both languages, Uzbek and English.

### **I. The general sentence place of adjectives in the English language**

Adjectives are words that modify nouns and pronouns. In the English language they always appear immediately before the nouns or the noun phrase that they modify, and when indefinite pronouns are modified by an adjective, they come after the pronoun. Generally, according to Bauer (2004) adjectives could be seen in two main positions: attributive and predicative. Attributive adjectives appear as noun modifiers while predicative adjectives are those that are likely to occur in the copular

construction. It has also been pointed out that most attributive adjectives have predicative uses. Here is an example: a happy person vs. They are happy. According to Quirk and Greenbaum (1991) adjectives can be syntactically sub classified into: attributive only, predicative only, intensifying adjectives, restrictive adjectives, adjectives related to adverbs and adjectives related to nouns.

### **II.1.1. Attributive adjectives**

Bauer (2004) names attributive adjectives as postmodifiers since they come after the head in a noun phrase, they are comprised of prepositional phrases and clauses. They give extra or specific information about the noun. Here are some examples given by him: Ex: A tall man with grey hair. Ex: That antique table she bought last year. Since there are different types of adjectives Baskerville & Sewell (1986) suggested that adjectives that denote attributes should be in a specific order before the noun, and that order of adjectives in English language is: determiners, observations, size, shape, age, color, origin, material and qualifiers. Ex: A lovely big round, white table. Ex: He bought an interesting, small, rectangular, red car. Ex: My friend lives in a beautiful, gigantic, new marble house. According to Bolinger (1967) adjectives are attributive when they premodify the head of a noun phrase as in the following examples: a small garden, a popular ballad. Generally seen adjectives can be attributive, which means that they occur before the nouns and after the determiners or they can be a part of the predicate of the sentence as in the examples below: Ex: Your pretty daughter is here. Ex: That man is a fool. According to Alexander (1988) adjectives which restrict the reference of the noun, are always attributive; as in the following examples: 'certain' (a woman of a certain age), 'chief' (my chief complaint), 'main' (my main concern), 'only' (the only explanation), 'principle' (the principle reason), 'sold' (my sold interest). These adjectives are only used attributively, expect for 'certain' and 'particular' which can change in meaning. Noted by Quirk and Greenbaum (1991) a few adjectives with emotive value are restricted to attributive position though the scope of the adjective extends to the person referred to by the noun. Here are some examples: you poor man, my dear lady, that wretched woman.

### **II.1.2. Predicative adjectives**

Adjectives are predicative when they function as the subject complement or object complement as in the examples: Ex: He seems careless – Cs; Ex: I find him careless – Co. Generally seen, adjective are subject complement not only to noun phrases but also to finite clauses and nonfinite clauses, as in the following examples: Ex: That you need a car is obvious. Ex: Whether she will resign is uncertain. An adjective could also be an object complement when there is co-reference between direct object and object complement which is stated by Alexander (1988): Ex: The situation made Mr. Hardy was courageous and even a bit daring. Adjectives according to Quirk and Greenbaum (1991) which are restricted or virtually restricted to predicative position are the most like verbs and adverbs. They tend to refer to a condition rather than to a characteristic. The most common are those referring to the health of an animate being: Ex: He felt ill/ poorly / well/ faint/unwell. An enormous group of adjectives that are restricted to a predicative position, can include adjectives

which can take complementation, here are some examples: able (to + infinitive), fond (of), afraid (that, of, about), glad (that, to), conscious (that, of), tantamount (to) etc.

### **II.1.3. Postpositive adjectives**

There are also certain adjectives that in combination with certain words are always postpositive, follow the noun or the pronoun that they modify. a) Postposition is obligatory for proper nouns in the meaning as in the following examples: Ex7: the City of London proper. b) Adjective can be postpositive in several institutionalized expressions, like the following ones: the president's elect, heir apparent, attorney general, notary public, body politic, and proof positive. c) Adjectives can be postpositive ending in -able and -ible, when they are modified by another adjective in superlative degree, here are some examples given by Quirk and Greenbaum (1991). Ex: the best use possible/ Ex: the greatest insult imaginable. Another issue about postposition adjectives is that postposition is usual for absent, present, concerned, and involved, as in the example: Ex: The soldiers present were his supporters.

### **II.1.4. Intensifying adjectives**

There are some adjectives that have heightening effect on the noun they modify, according to Quirk & Greenbaum (1991) there are three semantic sub-classification of intensifying adjectives: a) emphasers; b) amplifiers and c) downtoners Emphasizers have a heightening effect and are generally attributive only, eg: A true scholar, plain nonsense. Amplifiers are central adjectives if they are inherent and denote a high or extreme degree: a complete victory- The victory was complete; great destruction- The destruction was great. On the other hand, when they are noninherent amplifiers are attributive only: A complete fool- The fool is complete; A firm friend – The friend is firm. Here are some examples where adjectives as amplifiers are attributive only: a great supporter, a perfect stranger, total irresponsibility. Downtoners have a lowering effect, scaling downwards from an assumed norm. They are relatively few: slight in a slight effort, feeble in feeble joke. They can also be ignored because they are generally central adjectives.

### **II.1.5. Restrictive adjectives**

Restrictive adjectives restrict the reference of the noun exclusively, particularly or chiefly and they are used attributively. Here are some examples with noun phrases include: A certain person; his chief excuse.

II.1.6. Adjectives related to adverbs Some of noninherent adjectives that are only attributive can be related to adverbs; even they are not intensifying or restrictive, ex: My former friend, [formerly my friend]; an old friend, [a friend of old].

II.1.7. Adjectives related to nouns Denominal adjectives tend to be restricted to the attributive position: An atomic scientist [a scientist specializing in ten theory of atoms]; a criminal court [a court dealing with crime].

## **II. The general sentence place of adjectives in the Uzbek language**

The word order of adjectives in the Uzbek language is noun+adjective. Adjectives follow the noun that they in the following examples: Aziz ota, go'zal gul, Lola chiroyli ko'ylak sotib oldi . But they can also precede the head, adjective+noun

in this case the order is ligature+adjective+noun. In the Uzbek language, predicative adjectives also keep the ligature as in the following example: Baxti qora ota uzoq yillardan keyin surgundan qaytib keldi . Adjectives in the Uzbek language into frontal and non-frontal. Frontal adjectives are those that have a bivalent role in the sentence, the role of the subject, noun, and the role of the adjective at the same time and they stand at the front of the sentence meaning at the beginning of the sentence as in the following examples: Yigit derazadan kirib keldi. Xech bir zamon yomon yaxshiga aylanmaydi. In this classification are also included adjectives with foreign derivation that within the Uzbek language haven't been decoded in their component parts, as in the following examples: mutlaq, nafis etc. Frontal adjectives are less used in comparison to non frontal adjectives. When it comes to non frontal adjectives which are formulated with derivation – with prefixes, most productive suffixes are: Be- and No- forming adjectives with negative meaning: bepisand, betartib, beozor etc. A less productive prefix it is the prefix No- : norasmiy , noshukur. Generally seen, in the Uzbek language the place of .adjectives in the sentences is either attributive, they precede the noun that they modify or predicative, they follow the noun. But, when used in the attributive position they should be adjusted in number and gender with the noun that is connected. There are cases when they follow the noun that they modify and are remarkable in requiring a particle preceding them that agrees with the noun, eg: yosh bola (masculine), yosh qiz (feminine). The adjectives which function as predicative adjectives show the quality or characteristic of the subject. Unlike the predicative determinant that is expressed with noun, the predicative determinant expressed with adjective cannot refer to a direct object, but when predicative determinant refers to the subject, we can find it next to the transitive verb: Ex: Men unga hayrat bilan tikilayotganimni tushundi va yuzi yonib ketdi. When it comes to the adjective phrase, formulated with the formula adjective+noun with the prefix , and the adjective in the affirmative degree, they express relations between a quality and a thing, it limits the scope of the quality as in: Ex: Yo'ldan charchagan Ex: Go'zallikdan hayratda. The adjective phrases (adj+ adv) are used the most, usually adjectives express quality, and the adverb usually goes after the adjective. Most of these adverbs are adverbs of quantity like the following ones: oz, yetarli, ko'p, juda ko'p va hokazo. Masalan: Juda yaxshi. Bir oz yaxshi. The adjective phrase (inf +adj) are very limited in number: here are some infinitive adjectives given as examples: qodir, qobiliyatsiz, kuchsiz va hokazo. Their use it's very rare, because they compete with adjectives+word direct object with the predicative in subjunctive. We also have some examples for these adjectives Ex: Haydash mumkin emas. Masalan: yordam berishga tayyor. When it comes to another formulation of the adjective phrase we should mention (pron+adj) which are less used. Ex: Uning nigohida o'zgacha bir narsa bor edi. Ex: Bugun bizda qanday yangiliklar bor? Bugun bizda yangilik yo'q .

Comparing the sentence place of adjectives when they are translated from the Uzbek to the English language We have tried to compare the position of adjectives in sentences after they are translated from Uzbek to English with the help of translational paradigms which are exclusively done by native English translators taken from the Uzbek novels Firstly, we wrote down all the adjectives and their place



in the sentence in the Uzbek language together with their translated counterparts in the English language. Then we grouped them according to the most frequently used positions of adjectives and adjective phrases and finally we classified them into the most frequent major groups. During the process of noting down, we saw that the writer himself had the habit of using simple adjectives composed of the formula (noun+adjective), used for description and modification. construction was the same. Both of the constructions in both of the languages were an adjective that modifies a noun.

### **Conclusion**

The general and the most frequent rule of sentential adjectival position in Uzbek language is adjective+noun, in English it is adjective+noun. Uzbek adjectives have grammatical categories of number and case agreement with the noun that they define. They are inflected to exhibit grammatical relations other than the main form. They usually follow the noun that modify and are remarkable in requiring a particle preceding them in order to agree with the noun. While, in English, adjectives do not change, they remain constant in number and gender. Just as in Uzbek also in English, the adjective is used as modifier of the noun in the function of the predicate, subject or object. When it comes to the change of the order, in both languages it is applied only in special cases or only for stylistic reasons. Regarding the sentential place of adjectives during translation from the Uzbek to the English language we noticed the following cases: complete correlation and different correlation. Complete correlation was the situation when the place of adjectives and adjective phrases in the sentence together with the construction of the adjective phrase, was the same in both languages. Different correlation was the case where the place of adjectives and adjective phrases was totally different in both of the languages. Within this case there were two sub cases named as extensive and intensive correlation. Extensive correlation was when there was a simple adjective construction which modifies a noun in the predicative position in Uzbek, but in the translated paradigm in English, there was a complex adjectival phrase to express the same idea. Intensive correlation was the vice versa case, when there was a complex adjective phrase in Uzbek used attributively after the noun it modified but the construction of the adjective phrase in the translated paradigm in English was a simple adjective phrase formulated from an adjective and a noun in order to express the same idea.

### **References**

- Alexander, LG . (1988). English Grammar. Hongkong: Longman. pg.110-111.
- Beci, B. (2004). Gramatika e Gjuhës Shqipe për të gjithë. EDFa, Tiranë: pg.78
- Bauer, L. (2004). Adjectives, compounds and words. In Nordic journal of English Studies 3/1 (= Worlds of Words: A tribute to Arne Zettersten). pg. 7-22
- Baskervill, W. M. & Sewell, J. W. (1986). An English Grammar. Longman. Gmbh Hamburg, Germany. pg.80-82.
- Bolinger, D. (1967). Adjectives in English: attribution and predication. *Lingua* 18: 1-34
- Beograd: Filoloshki Fakultet. pg.18-23.

Levenston, E.A. (1965). The Translation Paradigm (A Technique for Contrastive Syntax). IRAL, 3 (3). pg. 221-225.

Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (1991). A student's Grammar of the English Language'' Longman. pg.88-89. Qitaku, F. (2009). Gramatika e: Zero Print. pg.41-47.

List of the corpus books Kadare, I. (1980). Ura me tri harqe. Prishtinë: Rilindja: pg. 28, 14.

Hodgson, J. (1997). The three arched bridge. New York: Arcade Publishing House: pg. 23, 11

Colman, D. (1980). The general of the dead army. London: Harvill Pres: pg. 19, 87,8,15