R.Zh. Saurbayev¹ 🆔 **, F.T. Yerekhanova*²** 🆔 **, A.K. Zhetpisbay³** 🆔
¹Toraighyrov University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan
²Central Asian Innovation University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan
³Alkey Margulan Pavlodar Pedagogical University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: rishat_1062@mail.ru¹, *siliconoasis702@gmail.com², a_kanzygaly@mail.ru³)

On the issue of the unambiguity of the expression of quantitative relations in a noun in English

Abstract. This article discusses the unambiguity of expressing quantitative relations in English nouns. The authors conclude that all the nouns they considered transmitted quantitative information. Unambiguity of uncountable nouns is achieved by contrasting the unmarked form of the noun of a single object with the marked form of the noun of multiple objects with the same noun. Collective countable nouns have inherent ambiguity, and the noun of the implied group is repeated in the plural form. Homogeneity and unambiguity of objects and unambiguity within a collective group of objects are essential for understanding the meaning of a collective term. Homogeneity allows us to distinguish individual elements within a group as a whole and helps create a clear understanding of the plural nature of the group. Collective nouns that refer to groups of similar objects are usually countable, while those that refer to heterogeneous groups are not. Abstract and concrete nouns in their unmarked forms function as a single unit, representing both a mental concept and a substance or material without entering into a numerical opposition with other concepts that cannot be quantified.
Keywords: unambiguity, abstract noun, collective noun, quantitative relations, homogeneity, semantic, category.

Introduction

The meanings of gender, number, and case, which are considered to be universal concepts for the nominal systems of Indo-European languages J.H. Ginsberg [1], W. O'Grady [2] underwent certain changes during the historical development of each language within this language family.

The changes in the grammatical structure of English have not affected all grammatical categories equally, including those of the nouns. The system of gender categories in the English noun collapsed during its historical development, and the differences that exist naturally are expressed in modern English through lexical rather than grammatical means.

According to G.N. Vorontsova, English has significantly deformed its case system, developing some characteristics of agglutination to a certain degree [3, 180-183]. Although during the historical development of the English language, the expression of quantitative relations in nouns, as well as in other parts of the nominal system, has undergone some changes, the forms of their transmission have turned out to be more stable compared to those of generic and case relations. This confirms the correctness of the thesis that it is possible to talk about the category of numbers in the paradigm of modern English nouns.

114 № 4(149)/2024

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы ЕҰУ Хабаршысы. Филология сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X, eISSN: 2663-1288

The category of numbers and its associated quantitative relations have received some attention in modern linguistics. However, some issues regarding the transfer of quantitative relations in English nouns seem to deserve further study. One such issue is the unambiguous expression of quantitative relations in a noun. Since nouns give names to objects in the real world, the concept of numbers in nouns reflects the distinction between individual objects and groups of objects. This concept is manifested in the interaction with the main meaning of a noun, which is the meaning of an object.

The number opposition is expressed by combining a set of similar objects and contrasting it with a single object that has the same noun. In other words, the noun is the same for all objects in the set.

Since nouns cover a wide range of concepts, the number category can be considered a complex semantic node that combines various grammatical and lexical features of nouns. We will try to understand how the principle of clarity in expressing quantitative relations is reflected in certain categories of nouns.

Literature review

The linguistic reality shows that the unambiguity principle manifests in specific countable nouns. These nouns refer to objects in the material world, which exist physically and have distinct forms. Such objects can be counted, and the usual way to express their multiplicity is by using the formula *1+1+1+1+...* = multiplicity, regardless of the number of objects involved.

The difference between a singular noun and a plural noun is clearly expressed in the form of the word: *a bee* becomes *bees*, *a rap* becomes *raps*, *a roof* becomes *roofs*, *a dish* becomes *dishes*, and *a friend* becomes *friends*, and so on. T.Clark et al. [4] and H. Klockmann [5] assume that "According to the method of adding homogeneous objects, some nouns form a set that does not have an external number marker These include well-known names of domestic animals (*sheep, pigs*), wild animals (*deer, buffalo, zebras*), birds that are hunted for food (ducks, wildfowl), fish (*salmon, carp, mackerel, cod*), and certain nationalities (*Japanese, Chinese, Iroquois*, etc.).

The constituent elements of these nouns' plural forms are homogeneous and unambiguous. They, like other countable nouns, can be combined with numerals and quantitative words, such as *"ten swine"*, *"few deer"*, *"seven carp"*, *"many mackerel"*, and *"several series"*.

A. Anttila and V. Fong state that "A certain number of abstract nouns have a long-standing and recognized use in the form of both singular and plural forms. These nouns, like other countable nouns, can be grouped by adding similar objects, although these objects are not physical, but rather mental [6].

B. Ilyish points out the difference in the internal meaning of the seemingly identical phrases *"three houses"* and *"three hours"* [7]. This difference stems from the fact that there is a group of nouns in English that carry a quantifiable attribute. This group includes words that represent time durations - *a minute, hour, year, fortnight, week* - as well as units of currency - *guinea, pound sterling* - and units of measurement - *meter, ton, and kilogram*. Although such nouns imply a division into lower-level units, this internal quantitative feature does not affect the perception of these nouns as singularities. Just like the previously discussed calculable nouns, these nouns form a set by adding homogeneous and unambiguous objects: *one dollar + one dollar + one dollar = three dollars*, and so on.

Collective nouns are of significant interest from the perspective of the transfer of quantitative relationships.

The unmarked singular form may reveal a varying degree of correspondence between the numerical form of the noun and the numerical form of words that form part of the same syntactical structure as this form. For example, in the sentence *"Jordan's party was calling impatiently from the porch," the singular form of "party"* indicates the existence of a collective unity, a group of people or objects that are thought of as a single entity.

Considering these nouns from different perspectives and angles, scientists view this group of nouns as a mysterious category that requires detailed analysis and careful interpretation.

ВЕСТНИК Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева. Серия Филология
BULLETIN of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. PHILOLOGY Series

№ 4(149)/2024

115

B. Strang does not find anything unusual about the singular form of words like "crowd", as "crowd" itself consists of a large number of individuals, just like each person consists of a vast number of cells [8].

While acknowledging the complex nature of collective nouns as a valid point, we cannot agree with B. Strang's assertion that there is equivalence between the constituent parts and the collective noun itself [8]. At the same time, it is important to consider the transfer of quantitative relationships by both calculable and collective nouns. Linguists generally agree that, unlike ordinary nouns, which refer to a single object under a single noun, collective nouns refer to an indefinite number of identical individuals so that even in the singular form, they imply a grouping of multiple objects.

The nouns in this category are interesting in that they do not refer to any specific material object, but rather to a group of objects that share a common characteristic. A small number of these nouns indicate their special position in the naming system.

Features of the quantity category and its reflection in names and nouns with the help of grammatical means attracted attention and aroused the interest of many linguists. Philologists such as N.Yu. Shvedova, L.D. Chesnokova, I.V. Pereverzeva, G. Corbet, and many others, in their works, cited various classifications of nouns based on their ability to express the category of quantity [9, 2].

Methodology
The following techniques are employed in the research process: Semantic analysis, linguistic classification, comparative methodology, transformational approach, distributional study, componential analysis and descriptive method.

Analysis and Discussion
Based on the data in the discussion section, we can admit that analysis of the above-mentioned collective nouns reveals that the sets of objects they refer to can be perceived both as a singular entity and as a collection of individual parts.

Moreover, in addition to the uncountable collective nouns discussed in our research, there are a significant number of other nouns that do not follow the standard rules for forming a singular or plural form. These include nouns that cannot be counted or have no plural or singular forms.

Some examples of these nouns are:
1. Abstract concepts: *socialism, patriotism, progress, annihilation, kindness, peace, strength*, etc.
2. Substances and materials: *air, butter, dough, ice, gold, coal, water*, etc.

These nouns do not combine the idea of multiplicity, which is expressed in numbers. They are unique and cannot be counted. Abstract nouns give a noun to something that can only be thought about and not perceived through the senses. The unmarked form of these nouns serves as a single sign for a homogeneous, indivisible whole. These nouns are extremely abstract in their quantitative aspect and do not involve division into separate parts. However, when it becomes necessary to specify the measure of an abstract concept, the language uses lexical and grammatical means, such as "*a piece of advice*", "*an act of perfection*", or "*a stroke of luck*" (Priestley, p. 80). In lexico-morphological classification, abstract nouns are considered uncountable, like real nouns. According to Jespersen [10], the ideas of uniqueness and plurality do not apply to real nouns and should not take the form of either number. A.A. Bain [11] argues that they should be used in the singular form because there can be no two complete and exhaustive collections of the same material or substance. B.S. Khaimovich and B.I. Rogovskaya [12] believe that uncountable nouns acquire an indirect or lexico-grammatical number meaning by analogy with most English nouns.

Although the denotation of real nouns has no clearly defined number, it still has tangible spatial boundaries. Therefore, real nouns refer to an undisclosed but objective entity that is perceived as a single set or mass of homogeneous, uncountable terms. The clarity of the transfer

116   № 4(149)/2024

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы ЕҰУ Хабаршысы. Филология сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X, eISSN: 2663-1288

of quantitative relations lies in the use of both abstract and concrete nouns, where the noun functions as a single symbol - the noun for either a unified whole or a substance composed of an unlimited and uncountably large number of small, homogeneous particles.

Due to the rapid development of functional-cognitive research study of traditional grammatical concepts from new positions is becoming an important part of modern linguistics. The category of number as one of the most important characteristics of a noun has long been attracting the attention of researchers from various linguistic fields [13, 3].

It is known that the process of combining individual objects into sets involves the establishment of a single criterion for their classification and the selection of a representative from the class. This representative should serve as a reference point and reflect the qualitative identity of each unit included in the set with the rest of the group. For a language, a set should include homogeneous objects whose differences are so small that each object would appear to be equal to any other. At the same time, adding each subsequent object to the set is not difficult.

Following the principle of uniformity among the constituent parts of groups designated by a collective noun, it is possible to divide these nouns into two categories:

1. Collectives that combine strictly homogeneous objects of the same noun, without ambiguity.

2. Collective nouns, which denote groups of individuals that are not completely homogenous, have different nouns. These nouns are based on a common feature that these groups share, and they can be classified into two main categories.

The first category includes collective nouns such as *"flock"*, *"herd"*, *"congregation"*, *"pack"*, *"swarm"*, *"cluster"*, *"covey"*, *"regiment"*, *"crew"*, *"troop"*, *"hive"*, *"farrow"*, *"galaxy"*, and *"jury"*. These terms are used to describe groups of animals or people that behave similarly.

The second category includes nouns such as *"furniture"*, *"china"*, *"crockery"*, *"money"*, *"napery"*, *"jewellery"*, *"linen"*, *"foliage"*, and others. These terms refer to collections of objects that are considered a single unit, even though they may be made up of different parts.

When considering this aggregate as a whole, the noun reflects the starting point of this type of unity, which is clothed in an unmarked form and reveals a unique environment. For example, when discussing the degree of mercury poisoning in a family, a person might say: *"My family has the highest tested level."* (Canadian Tribune, October 1, 2014) Or: *"At last, the army of advertising managers, copywriters, commercial artists, colour printers, window dressers, and bill posters were charging towards victory."*

Implicitly enclosing within themselves the meaning of a multitude of individual, homogeneous objects, formed by adding qualitatively identical units, such collective nouns exhibit the ability to double, triple, etc., and are clothed in the plural form as soon as it becomes necessary to indicate a certain number of such groups. Thus, we have two flocks of sheep, several herds of cattle, these *congregations of nuns, a few packs of wolves, more than two bands of ruffians, a great many swarms of bees, many crowds of people, three flights of pigeons, five clusters of grapes, numerous galaxies of stars*, etc.

In this case, the plural form of collective nouns acquires the meaning of a plurality of sets, each of which is perceived as a discrete unit, and therefore these nouns are subject to the general law of calculability.

Combining an indefinite number of homogeneous discrete entities under one noun implies the internal calculability of collective nouns in the first subgroup. Therefore, *a swarm* is a grouping of homogeneous entities bearing the same noun, such as *bees*, for example.

In turn, the ability of these nouns to enter into numerical opposition, such as *"a swarm - swarms"*, generates explicit calculability. This kind of multiplicity, explicated by the grammatical form, includes both the multiplicity expressed by the internal content of the noun and the multiplicity marked by the grammatical form.

This fact allowed O. Jespersen [10] to aptly noun these doubly calculable collective nouns. It is not uncommon for collective nouns in the first subgroup to be interpreted as separative pluralities, as in the example: "Mu family have been prominent, well-to-do people in this Middle

Western city for three generations." The example given on page 5, and many similar examples, indicate that the perception of such nouns as separative plurals, referring to each member of the group, is associated with the factor of uniformity of objects included in the collective entity. This includes groups such as a throng of merrymakers, a jury of citizens, a troupe of minstrels, a crew of sailors, a regiment of soldiers, a band of girls, and a group of ruffians.

The factor of uniformity in the constituent parts of a set can also be explained by the mandatory interpretation of nouns such as *people, militia, police, gentry, clergy, cattle*, and *poultry* as separative collective entities. Since the first subgroup of collective nouns includes all uncountable collective nouns, such as "*people, militia, police*", etc., although they represent entities consisting of homogeneous units, their uncountability can be explained by the generalizing nature of their meaning and the absence of separate discrete units with such nouns in their main meaning that can be counted.

Among the uncountable collective nouns that imply only the meaning of a set of elements in a group, there is only one exception: the noun "*people*", which, when used as a plural, can be combined with numbers or words from a quantitative series. To represent a single group object in the language, the complex word *"c-man"* is used for *"militia"*, *"clergy"*, and *"police"*, and the lexeme *"person"* for *"people"*, which, although it can be combined with numbers, does not correspond to the numeral *"one"*, and the specifying word *"head"* for *"cattle"* and *"poultry"*.

The double interpretation of the collective nouns in the first subgroup may be the reason for the lack of agreement in the linguistic literature on their use in singular or plural forms. Thus, some linguists, such as G. Leech and J.A. Svartvik [11], and others, believe that a speaker may choose to interpret a collective noun as an indivisible unit and use a singular verb with it, or they may distinguish between separate individuals and use a plural verb predicate.

On the other hand, other linguists, including W. MkAvoy [12], F. Sek and others, disagree with this approach and argue that it is inappropriate and awkward to use the plural form of the verb with these nouns in an unmarked context. In this regard, it should be noted that not all countable collective nouns have the same ability to be perceived as a separate entity and to demonstrate this through their surroundings. This property is most often found in the nouns of groups of people, but also occasionally in the nouns of living creatures, such as crew, party, committee, jury, and regiment.

This fact suggests that to interpret a collective noun as a group, the concepts of uniformity and distinctiveness of its members must overlap with animacy. For example, when referring to a group of inanimate objects, such as a cluster of grapes or a bunch of flowers, the plural form is used, indicating that they are perceived as separate entities. However, when referring to groups of living creatures or people, the singular form may be used, as in the case of a crew or a committee. The second subgroup of words in this work includes collective nouns that group objects that are not entirely homogeneous or unambiguous but are classified according to a specific feature. These nouns, which denote a set of units that are conceived as a single entity, are always thought of as a whole and cannot be counted. Their meaning can potentially be broken down into its constituent parts, which are different objects. To refer to a single composite object of this type, the English language often uses additional words to clarify the meaning.

Conclusion

From the above, it can be concluded that all the nouns considered here are characterized by unambiguity in the transmission of quantitative relations.

1. In the field of specific, calculable, non-selective nouns, unambiguity is expressed by contrasting the unmarked form of the noun of a single object with the marked form of the noun of many objects bearing the same noun as the single object. That is, the noun of a single object must be repeated in the noun of the plurality, as the noun of one object cannot be used to refer to a group of objects;

2. Collective countable nouns, when perceived as a single whole, do not differ from the nouns described in point "a" in terms of their quantitative relations, although they are characterized by

implicit ambiguity of the homogeneous objects included in the collective noun. This ambiguity is manifested in the grammatical forms of the plural: the noun of the implied grouping is repeated when forming the plural. For example, regiment-regiments, swarm-swarms, and crew-crews;

3. In a group of objects that are referred to by a collective noun, the nouns of individual members are not repeated in the collective noun itself. For example, a swarm of bees is a group of bees, and the noun "swarm" does not include the noun of each bee. The plurality of objects in a collective group is not indicated by a grammatical marker in the collective noun;

4. The homogeneity and unambiguity of objects and unambiguity of the object within a group indicated by a collective noun are important for understanding the meaning of the collective term. This homogeneity allows us to understand the individual elements within the group as a whole. This also helps to create a clear picture of the plural nature of the group, which is indicated by the collective noun;

5. The homogeneity and unambiguity of objects within a collective group determines whether a collective noun can be counted or not. Collective nouns that refer to groups of similar objects are usually countable, while those that refer to heterogeneous groups are not. In the case of abstract and concrete nouns, the unmarked form functions as a single unit, serving both as a noun for a mental object and a designation for a substance or material. Neither those nor the other enter into a numerical opposition in connection with the transfer of concepts whose denotation does not indicate the ability to quantify, double, triple, etc.

References

1. Greenberg, J.H. Universals of Language. – London: MIT Press, 1963. – 113p.

2. O'Grady, W. Fundamental universals of language // Lingua. – 2010. – Vol. 120. – №12. – P. 2707-2712. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2010.03.006

3. Vorontsova, G.N. Essays on English grammar. – Moscow: Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages, 1960. – 74p.

4. Clark, T., Tratt, L. Formalizing Homogeneous Language Embeddings // Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science. – 2020. – Vol. 253. – №7. – P.75-88. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2010.08.033

5. Klockmann, H. The article a(n) in English quantifying expressions: A default marker of cardinality // Glossa: a Journal of General Linguistics. – 2020. – Issue 462. Vol.5(1). – P.1-31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1151

6. Anttila, A., Fong, V. Variation, ambiguity, and noun classes in English // Lingua. – 2003. – Vol. 114. №9-10. – P.1253-1290. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2003.06.001

7. Ilyish, B. The Structure of Modern English. – Moscow, 1970. – 318 p.

8. Strang, B. Modem English Structure. – Leningrad, 1969. – 106 p.

9. Рогачева, Е.С. Выражение количественных отношений в формах числа подлежащего, выраженного именем существительным в английском языке // В мире науки и искусства: вопросы филологии, искусствоведения и культурологии [Электронный ресурс]. – 2015. – №1 (44). – С.72-78. – URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/vyrazhenie-kolichestvennyh-otnosheniy-v-formah-chisla-podlezhaschego-vyrazhennogo-imenem-suschestvitelnym-v-angliyskom-yazyke (дата обращения: 03.07.2023).

10. Jespersen, O. The philosophy of grammar. – London: Routledge, 2006. – 359 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203716045

11. Bain, A. A Higher English Grammar. – London: Forgotten Books, 2018. – 392p.

12. Khaimovich, B.S., Rogovskaya, B.I. A Course in English Grammar. – Moscow, 1967. – 122 p.

13. Махмудова С.С. Средства выражения единичности и множественности в таджикском и немецком языках: сопоставительный аспект: автореф. дисс... канд. филол. наук: защищена 16.02.2024 / Махмудова Сайёра Сафаровна. – Душанбе, 2023. – 28с.

14. Leech, G., Svartvik, J. A Communicative Grammar of English. – London: Routledge, 2003. – 456 p.

15. Buckler, W., McAvoy, W. American College Handbook of English Fundamental. – New York, 1966. – 120 p.

ВЕСТНИК Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева. Серия Филология
BULLETIN of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. PHILOLOGY Series

№ 4(149)/2024   119

Р.Ж. Саурбаев¹, Ф.Т. Ереханова*², А.К. Жетписбай³
¹ *Торайғыров университеті, Павлодар, Қазақстан*
² *Орталық Азия Инновациялық университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан*
³*Әлкей Марғұлан атындағы Павлодар педагогикалық университеті, Павлодар, Қазақстан*

Ағылшын тіліндегі сандық қатынастардың есімділігінің бір мәнсіздігі мәселесі туралы

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада ағылшын тіліндегі зат есімдердегі сандық қатынастарды білдірудің бір мәнділігі қарастырылады. Авторлар өздері қарастырған барлық зат есімдер сандық ақпаратты бергендеген қорытындыға келеді. Санақсыз зат есімнің көп мағыналылығы бір зат есімнің таңбасыз түрін бір зат есімі бар көп зат есімнің таңбалы түріне қарсы қою арқылы жүзеге асады. Жиынтық есептік сан есімдерге тән көп мағыналылық бар, ал тұспал топтың зат есімі көпше түрде қайталанады. Ұжымдық терминнің мағынасын түсіну үшін объектілердің біртектілігі мен анық еместігі және объектілердің ұжымдық тобының бір мәнділігі маңызды. Біртектілік жалпы топтағы жеке элементтерді ажыратуға мүмкіндік береді және топтың көпше сипатын нақты түсінуге көмектеседі. Ұқсас объектілер тобына жататын жиынтық есімдер әдетте есептелетін болады, ал гетерогенді топтарға жататындар санауға жатпайды. Абстрактілі және нақты зат есімдер таңбаланбаған түрлерінде сандық тұрғыдан анықталмайтын басқа ұғымдармен сандық қарама-қайшылыққа түспей, ментальді ұғымды да, субстанцияны немесе материалды да білдіретін біртұтас бірлік қызметін атқарады.

Түйін сөздер: көп мағыналылық, дерексіз зат есім, жиынтық есім, сандық қатынас, біртектілік, мағыналық, категория.

Р.Ж. Саурбаев¹, Ф.Т. Ереханова*², А.К. Жетписбай³
¹ *Торайғыров Университет, Павлодар, Казахстан*
² *Центрально-Азиатский инновационный университет, Шымкент, Казахстан*
³ *Павлодарский педагогический университет имени А.Маргулана, Павлодар, Казахстан*

К вопросу об однозначности выражения количественных отношений существительным в английском языке

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматривается однозначность выражения количественных отношений в английских существительных. Авторы приходят к выводу, что все рассмотренные ими существительные передавали количественную информацию. Однозначность неисчисляемых существительных достигается путем противопоставления немаркированной формы существительного одного предмета маркированной форме существительного нескольких предметов с одним и тем же существительным. Собирательным исчисляемым существительным присуща двусмысленность, и существительное подразумеваемой группы повторяется во множественном числе. Однородность и однозначность объектов, а также однозначность внутри собирательной группы объектов необходимы для понимания значения собирательного термина. Гомогенность позволяет нам различать отдельные элементы внутри группы в целом и помогает создать четкое понимание множественной природы группы. Собирательные существительные, относящиеся к группам схожих объектов, обычно являются исчисляемыми, а те, которые относятся к разнородным группам, — нет. Абстрактные и конкретные существительные в своих немаркированных формах функционируют как единая единица, представляя как мысленное понятие, так и вещество или материал, не вступая в числовое противопоставление с другими понятиями, не поддающимися количественной оценке.

Ключевые слова: однозначность, абстрактное существительное, собирательное существительное, количественные отношения, однородность, семантический, категория.

References

1. Greenberg, J.H. Universals of Language (MIT Press, London, 1963, 113 p.)

2. O'Grady, W. Fundamental universals of language. Lingua, 120(12), 2707-2712 (2010). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2010.03.006

3. Vorontsova, G.N. Essays on English grammar (Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages, Moscow, 1960, 74p.)

4. Clark, T., Tratt, L. Formalizing Homogeneous Language Embeddings. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, 253(7), 75-88 (2020). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2010.08.033

5. Klockmann, H. The article a(n) in English quantifying expressions: A default marker of cardinality. Glossa: a Journal of General Linguistics, Issue 462, 5(1), 1-31 (2020). DOI: https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1151

6. Anttila, A., Fong, V. Variation, ambiguity, and noun classes in English. Lingua, 114(9–10), 1253-1290 (2003). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2003.06.001

7. Ilyish, B. The Structure of Modern English (Moscow, 1970, 318 p.)

8. Strang, B. Modem English Structure (Leningrad, 1969, 106 p.)

9. Rogacheva, E.S. Vyrazhenie kolichestvennyh otnoshenij v formah chisla podlezhashchego, vyrazhennogo imenem sushchestvitel'nym v anglijskom yazyke [Expression of quantitative relations in the forms of the number of the subject expressed by a noun in English], V mire nauki i iskusstva: voprosy philologii, iskusstvovedeniya i kulturologii [Electronic recourse], №1 (44), 72-78 (2015). – Available at: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/vyrazhenie-kolichestvennyh-otnosheniy-v-formah-chisla-podlezhaschego-vyrazhennogo-imenem-suschestvitelnym-v-angliyskom-yazyke (accessed: 03.07.2023) [in Russian]

10. Jespersen, O. The philosophy of grammar (Routledge, London, 2006, 359 p.). DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203716045

11. Bain, A. A Higher English Grammar (Forgotten Books, London, 2018, 394 p.)

12. Khaimovich, B.S., Rogovskaya, B.I. A Course in English Grammar (Moscow, 1967, 122p.)

13. Mahmudova S.S. Sredstva vyrazheniya edinichnosti i mnozhestvennosti v tadzhikskom i nemeckom yazykah: sopostovitel'nyj aspekt [Means of expressing singularity and plurality in Tajik and German languages: a comparative aspect]: Abstract of thesis for Candidate of Philology (Dushanbe, 2023, 28 p.) [In Russian].

14. Leech, G., Svartvik, J. A Communicative Grammar of English (Routledge, London, 2003, 456 p.)

15. Buckler, W., McAvoy, W. American College Handbook of English Fundamental (New York, 1966, 120 p.)

Information about the authors:

Saurbayev R.Z. – Candidate of Philology, Professor, Toraighyrov University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan. E-mail: rishat_1062@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0003-1419-7361.

Yerekhanova F.T. – corresponding author, Candidate of Philology, Acting Associate Professor, Central Asian Innovation University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan. E-mail: siliconoasis702@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-3344-3839.

Zhetpisbay A.K. – Candidate of Philology, Acting Associate Professor, Alkey Margulan Pavlodar Pedagogical University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan. E-mail: a_kanzygaly@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0002-3126-5242.

Саурбаев Р.Ж. – кандидат филологических наук, профессор, Торайгыров университет, Павлодар, Казахстан. E-mail: rishat_1062@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0003-1419-7361.

Ереханова Ф.Т. – автор для корреспонденции, кандидат филологических наук, и.о. ассоциированного профессора, Центрально-Азиатский инновационный университет, Шымкент, Казахстан. E-mail: siliconoasis702@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-3344-3839.

ВЕСТНИК Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева. Серия Филология
BULLETIN of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. PHILOLOGY Series

№ 4(149)/2024   121

Жетписбай А.К. – кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Павлодарский педагогический университет имени А.Маргулана, Павлодар Казахстан. E-mail: a_kanzygaly@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0002-3126-5242.

Саурбаев Р.Ж. – филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Торайғыров университет, Павлодар, Қазақстан. E-mail: rishat_1062@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0003-1419-7361.

Ереханова Ф.Т. – хат-хабар үшін автор, филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор м.а., Орталық Азия Инновациялық университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан. E-mail: siliconoasis702@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-3344-3839.

Жетписбай А.К. – филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент, Әлкей Марғұлан атындағы Павлодар педагогикалық университеті, Павлодар, Қазақстан. E-mail: a_kanzygaly@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0002-3126-5242.

122 № 4(149)/2024

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы ЕҰУ Хабаршысы. Филология сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X, eISSN: 2663-1288