American Journal of Philological Sciences

Observations On Case Forms In Some Turkic Languages

Matluba Maxmudova

Basic Doctoral Student of Tashkent State University Of Uzbek Language And Literature, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Each language possesses its unique characteristics, both grammatically and lexically. It is well known that in the 20th century, the theory of Uzbek grammar was developed based on the Russian language grammar model. This influence is clearly reflected in the number and functional-semantic features of case forms, although these two languages belong to different language families. This article discusses the specific features of the case category in Turkic languages.

Introduction: The category of case is a grammatical system of forms that, after the number category (and if present, after the possessive form, but before conjugational markers), is added to a word to express syntactic relations. Case forms also embody morphological features, which will be discussed in more detail in our future articles.

The process by which the case forms of a word are altered is called inflection, and the case form itself is referred to as inflective. The inflective belongs to the derivational type of grammatical morphemes. The case marker completes the word, converting a base into a full-fledged word. In this respect, the case marker is generally the final element in the morphemic structure of a word (with the exception of words functioning as predicates or those preceded by postpositions).

The case, first and foremost, is not a word class indicator, but a grammatical form that determines syntactic roles. From this perspective, the case is considered an inter-class category. However, the case category is not uniformly applicable to all word classes. For instance, it is naturally inherent to nouns, and is one of the essential forms for the appearance of noun lexemes in speech. Besides nouns, other parts of speech can also take case forms, including pronouns, verbal nouns, and certain forms of collective numerals. These can be considered noun-like forms of other word classes.

The third group consists of nominalized forms of other parts of speech. For this group, case is not an essential, permanent, or primary form, but is added when required by context or syntactic function. These include adjectives, adjective-pronouns, participles, and others. Case forms are attached to nominal parts of speech.

Based on the above, the words that take case forms can be divided into the following groups:

1. Nouns

2. Noun-like words (closely resembling nouns)

3. Nominalized words (forms of other classes functioning as nouns)

This tripartite classification is necessary not only for analyzing case forms but also for examining number and possessive categories.

Case does not form all syntactic units (sentence elements) in speech. For instance, it does not participate in the formation of attributes. However, many sentence components and even certain sentence types are formed with case. For example, syntactic units such as the subject, possessive modifier, apposition, and nominative sentence all involve case forms. Even predicate and adverbial modifiers may partially be expressed using case forms. Hence, the case category plays a vital role in the formation of syntactic structures.

Modern Standard Uzbek employs a six-case system:

1. Nominative case

2. Genitive case

3. Accusative case

4.   Ablative case

5.   Dative case

6.   Locative/Temporal case

Case Paradigm

Linguistic units exist in paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and hierarchical relations. They operate within a grammatical-semantic system in which two or more units mutually presuppose or exclude one another.

SCIENTIFIC-THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON CASE FORMS IN SOME TURKIC LANGUAGES

We can classify the object of our linguistic study within the language system as follows:

1.   Grammatical-semantic system

2.   Grammatical-semantic field

3.   Grammatical category

4.   Grammatical paradigm

5.   Grammatical form

6.   Grammatical meaning

Among the grammatical categories in agglutinative languages, the case category stands out for its rich variations and positional-semantic alternatives. In the Turkish language, which belongs to this group, case suffixes are called ad durum ekleri. The Turkish language has six cases, just like Uzbek, and they correspond as follows:

1.   Nominative case – yalın hâl

2.   Genitive case – ilgi hâli

3.   Accusative case – belirtme hâli

4.   Ablative case – ayrılma hâli

5.   Dative case – yönelme hâli

6.   Locative/Temporal case – bulunma hâli

Furthermore, some Turkish scholars assert that there are seven or even nine types of cases. According to [Ergin M., Universiteler için Türk Dili, Bayrak Basımevi, Istanbul, 2000], three more suffixes can also be considered as cases:

1) Instrumental case – vasıta hâli

2) Equative case – eşitlik hâli

3) Directional case – yön gösterme hâli

In historical grammar works on the Uzbek (and Turkic) languages, additional information is found regarding the existence of an instrumental case. [1, p. 96] This suggests that the number of case forms in Uzbek is not limited to six but is in fact much higher.

In inflectional languages—particularly Russian linguistics—a wide range of studies has been devoted to the case category, including "the meanings of cases,"

"the theory of case meanings," "the problem of classifying cases," "general theory of cases," "case field," and "case and vocative," among others. The abundance of such studies and the repeated investigation of the case category indicates that it is a central and multifaceted phenomenon in linguistic theory.

In the last quarter of the 20th century, significant research into the semantics of case in Russian linguistics was conducted by scholars such as Shvedova, Zolotova, Arutyunova, Popova, Beloshapkova, Gak, Khodova, Cheshko, and Revzin. In global linguistics, representatives of structural linguistics such as Ch. Fillmore, A. Wierzbicka, E. Babbie, and S. Adamson explored the case system from "functional-semantic," "system-structural," and "typological-logical" perspectives.

What do "invariant" and "variant" mean? Is an invariant always necessary, or can a form exist without one? Is the concept of a variant the same across all language levels? To what extent can elements of a language structure become variant? When do differing elements emerge from the spread of variants? In Russian linguistics, research was initiated to answer such questions in various fields.

With its abstract grammatical meaning, case expresses the syntactic and semantic relationship of a noun to other words or phrases in a sentence, i.e., it shows how a noun is connected to either naming or predicating units in speech.

Many researchers study case either as a morphological category or as a syntactic one. In semantic syntax, especially when analyzing the asymmetrical nature of sentence elements, the case paradigm becomes the object of investigation in two ways:

1.   As part of the noun paradigm (morphological category)

2.   As part of word combinations or sentences (syntactic category)

Since case reflects the syntactic relationship of a dependent word to a governing word, there are situations where case is used in the absence of a governing word and thus serves a semantic rather than syntactic function (e.g., "This gift is for you," "I hope for you"). In such instances, case goes beyond its general grammatical meaning and not only links but also adds additional semantic content.

As a sentence element, case can create multilayered oppositions. For instance, based on the criterion of "inability to function as a subject," the nominative case is seen as weak, whereas other cases are considered strong. Based on the ability to act as a direct object

without prepositions, the nominative, accusative, and ablative cases form a partial opposition: the nominative and ablative cases are unmarked, while the accusative case is marked because it is specifically designed for that function. This list can be extended based on such features.

Semantic criteria can also serve as a basis for opposition. For example, based on "possession of definiteness," the nominative is weak (as it may express both definite and indefinite meanings), whereas other cases express definiteness more strongly:

"He went to school" (Maktab ketdi) vs. "He went toward the school" (Maktabga ketdi).

While many such semantic oppositions can be identified, the most stable and prominent basis for case oppositions remains syntactic features. Under the "shadow" of absolute syntactic opposition, semantic features are also revealed.

Syntactically, the case category expresses subordination; semantically, it serves to indicate objecthood, eventivity, and locality.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, every language is unique and possesses its own distinct grammatical and lexical systems. As is well known, the grammar of the Uzbek language was developed based on Russian grammatical models in the 20th century. This influence is clearly reflected in the number and functional-semantic features of case forms. However, as these two languages belong to entirely different language families, the case paradigm in Uzbek should be considered as a separate system. The number and functional-semantic features of cases must be defined in accordance with the intrinsic properties of the Turkic languages.

REFERENCES

1. O'zbek tili grammatikasi. I tom. O'zbekiston . "Fan" nashriyoti,1975.

2. "O'zbek tiling izohli lug'ati" . -Toshkent: 2006.

3. X.A.Dadaboyev, Z.T. Xolmanova. Turkiy tillarning qiyosiy-tarixiy grammatikasi. -Toshkent: "Tafakkur bo'stoni ", 2015.

4. B.Mengliyev, O'.Xoliyorov ,N. Abdurahmonova. O'zbek tilidan universal qo'llanma -Toshkent: "Akademnashr ", 2015 .

5. H. Ne'matov. Chegara kelishigi // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti jurnali,1971.

6. Rasulov R.O'zbek tilida bosh kelishik va uning grammatikfunksiyalari/1956.

7. Rasulov R. Chiqish kelishigi/ Andijon, 1957.

8. Ma'rufov A. O'zbek adabiy tilidagi ikki kelishik formasi haqida// O'zbek tili va adabiyoti masalalari,1958.

9. G'.Abdurahmonov, Sh. Shukurov, Q. Mahmudov. O'zbek tilining tarixiy grammatikasi – Toshkent, 2008.