

STUDY OF THE PROPERTIES OF QUALITATIVE GENUS CONJUGATION IN WORLD LINGUISTICS

Egamova Chamangul Umirovna

Teacher at secondary School № 50, Kitab district

Abstract

This article analyzes the history of research and theoretical approaches to the characteristics of the compatibility of the qualitative category in world linguistics. The article discusses the main stages of research on the syntactic and semantic conjugation of adjectives in different languages, their compatibility, and their role in the structure of a sentence.

Keywords: Quality, conjunctive, qualitative vocabulary, syntactic conjunctive, semantic flexibility, world linguistics, corpus linguistics, cognitive linguistics, language system, phrase.

JAHON TILSHUNOSLIGIDA SIFAT TURKUMI BIRIKUVCHANLIK XUSUSIYATLARINING O'RGANILISHI

Egamova Chamangul Umirovna

Kitob tumani 50-umumta'lim maktabi o'qituvchisi

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqola jahon tilshunosligida sifat turkumi birikuvchanlik xususiyatlarining o'rganilish tarixi va nazariy yondashuvlarini tahlil qiladi. Maqolada turli tillarda sifatning sintaktik va semantik birikuvchanlik qobiliyatlari, ularning so'z birikmalari va gap tarkibidagi o'rni bo'yicha olib borilgan tadqiqotlarning asosiy bosqichlari ko'rib chiqiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: sifat, birikuvchanlik, sifat-so'z birikmalari, sintaktik birikuvchanlik, semantik moslashuvchanlik, jahon tilshunosligi, korpus lingvistikasi, kognitiv lingvistika, til tizimi, kollokatsiya.

ИЗУЧЕНИЕ СВОЙСТВ СПРЯЖЕНИЯ КАЧЕСТВЕННОГО РОДА В МИРОВОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ

Эгамова Чамангуль Умировна

Учитель средней школы № 50 Китабского района
государственного университета

Аннотация

В данной статье анализируются история изучения и теоретические подходы к характеристике сочетаемости качественного разряда в мировой лингвистике. В статье рассмотрены основные этапы исследований синтаксической и семантической спрягаемости прилагательных в разных языках, их сочетаемости и роли в структуре предложения.

Ключевые слова: Качество, конъюнктив, качественно-словарный запас, синтаксическая конъюнктив, семантическая гибкость, мировая Лингвистика, корпусная лингвистика, когнитивная лингвистика, языковая система, словосочетание.

In recent years, linguistic research has paid particular attention to the in-depth study and analysis of the semantic properties of words. This tendency is directly related to the fact that a

word does not exist in the language system as an isolated unit completely independent of other linguistic elements; on the contrary, in speech activity it is constantly used within combinations with other lexical units and within the framework of semantic and syntactic relations. A number of contemporary linguists emphasize that the category of adjectives is one of the least studied parts of speech in both English and Russian. Although the specific syntactic functions of adjectives in sentences and their semantic and combinatory properties in various word combinations have been examined to a certain extent by some researchers, there is still no scholarly consensus within the academic community regarding the scientific grouping and classification of words belonging to this category, as well as the systematic description of their combinatory potential.

In the author's view, identifying the internal principles of grouping within the adjective category and conducting a comparative-analytical study of their combinability (combinatory) properties based on English and Russian language material will make it possible to gain a clearer understanding of the functional and semantic significance of this category in the respective languages. Such an approach not only reveals the specific characteristics of adjectives but also holds considerable theoretical and practical importance for a deeper understanding of the general regularities of the language system.

Analyses show that in English linguistics the category of adjectives is primarily studied by dividing it into two types: qualitative and relative adjectives. Relative adjectives are usually derived and express a quality in relation to another person, object, event, place, material, time, or action [1:122-125]. Such adjectives do not possess the category of degrees of comparison. For example, adjectives such as *daily*, *monthly*, *weekly*, *southern*, *wooden*, and *Russian* belong to the relative category. Qualitative adjectives, on the other hand, express the inherent qualities of persons and objects directly, without relating them to other entities. Like adjectives in other languages, they may have degrees of comparison (positive, comparative, superlative): *red*, *beautiful*, *large*, *tasty*, and so on. Thus, the main criterion for distinguishing qualitative and relative adjectives in English is whether the quality is expressed directly or indirectly (through relation). In addition, another important feature distinguishing relative adjectives from qualitative ones is the active use of special derivational suffixes in their formation. In particular, suffixes such as *-en*, *-em*, *-ian*, *-ic*, and *-ical* participate primarily in the derivation of relative adjectives. Examples such as *golden*, *Serbian*, *atomic*, and *medical* clearly confirm this. It is noteworthy that the Uzbek translations of some relative adjectives may belong to the noun category (for example, *golden* – *oltin*, *wooden* – *yog'och*), which once again demonstrates the relativity of boundaries between word classes in cross-linguistic comparative studies.

The fact that relative adjectives lack the category of degrees of comparison should be linked to their primary denotative meaning. Since relative adjectives in their basic, direct meaning express a quality in relation to another object, phenomenon, or feature, their gradability is logically limited. However, in figurative, metaphorical, or contextual meanings, certain relative adjectives can freely take degrees of comparison, express the quality directly and independently, and consequently shift into the category of "qualitative" adjectives. Taking this situation into account, the Russian linguist V.V.Vinogradov concluded that "the morphological differences between qualitative and relative adjectives are conditional and are neither permanent nor obligatory" [2:172]. Vinogradov's view is fully applicable not only to Russian morphology but also to the grammatical system of English. This can be confirmed by several examples. For instance, certain qualitative adjectives in English (such as *blind*) do not have degrees of comparison. Conversely, some relative adjectives can form adverbs (for example, *historic* – *historically*). These cases clearly demonstrate that the boundary between qualitative and relative adjectives is not absolute.

In English linguistics, there are two main approaches to the classification of the adjective category. One group of scholars (Z.A.Kharitonchik, B.S.Khaimovich, V.L.Kaushanskaya, and others) considers it appropriate to divide English adjectives into two major groups – qualitative

and relative [3,4,5]. Another group of scholars (I.P.Ivanova, V.V.Burlakova, G.G.Pochepsev) proposes dividing adjectives into three groups: qualitative, relative, and quantitative [6]. In their view, words such as *much*, *many*, *little*, and *few* form a separate group of quantitative adjectives. At this point, it is important to take into account the grammatical peculiarities of typologically unrelated languages [7]. In Uzbek, the above-mentioned quantitative words are usually regarded as belonging to the adverb category because they frequently combine with verbs. In English, however, they primarily form combinations with nouns. This difference stems from the typological characteristics of the languages and once again confirms the complexity of applying a universal approach to the classification of the adjective category.

At the same time, some linguists maintain that only qualitative adjectives exist in English and consider it important to conduct an in-depth study of their lexical-semantic potential. V.D.Arakin, a supporter of this approach, draws attention to the fact that the function of relative adjectives can sometimes be performed by nouns. For example, in the combinations *a stone wall* and *a gold watch*, the words *stone* and *gold*, despite being nouns, function as attributive modifiers. This situation weakens the arguments for treating relative adjectives as a separate morphological class in English. M.Y.Blox, on the other hand, proposes dividing English adjectives into evaluative and determinative (specificative) groups. According to him, evaluative adjectives can simultaneously perform a determinative function in live speech. However, in the author's view, Blox's approach cannot be fully accepted. Because any adjective that combines with a noun serves to specify, describe, or delimit some aspect of it. Therefore, it is natural for evaluative adjectives to also perform a determinative function, and on this basis, distinguishing a separate "determinative adjective" class lacks sufficient justification.

Similar ideas can be found in the works of G.Sweet. He considers it appropriate to divide adjectives into attributive and qualifying groups. Sweet emphasizes that the same adjective may belong to different groups depending on the speech situation and the nature of the combination. He cites the adjective *great* as an example: in the combination *a great man*, it belongs to the attributive group, whereas in *great stupidity*, it performs a qualifying function. This example clearly shows that the functional boundaries of adjectives are not absolute and that their classification often depends on context and syntactic position.

In Western linguistics, approaches that classify adjectives not according to their semantic properties but according to their syntactic function and functional characteristics within the sentence are also widespread. Within this approach, the following three main criteria are primarily taken into account: a) the syntactic position and function of the adjective in the sentence; b) the lexical-syntactic properties of the noun with which the adjective combines (whether it is concrete/abstract, countable/uncountable, singular/collective, or denotes a person/object/process/place, as well as its activity as subject, predicate, object, etc.); c) the nature of the relationship between the adjective and the noun, and whether the adjective+noun combination is simple or complex, and whether it requires another determiner or not.

According to the first criterion, the ability of adjectives to appear in various syntactic functions in the sentence (attributive, predicative, object, etc.) and their specialization for certain functions are of primary importance. The second criterion focuses on the type of noun the adjective combines with and the semantic-syntactic properties of that combination. The third criterion concerns the internal structure of the combination and its relations with other linguistic units. One of the proponents of this direction, the linguist M. Bryant, emphasized the necessity of taking lexical-syntactic factors into account when classifying adjectives. According to him, the classification of adjectives should be based on their position in the sentence. M. Bryant recommends grouping adjectives according to two main criteria: – according to their syntactic position in the sentence – into attributive and predicative groups; – according to their lexical meaning – into restricted and unrestricted groups.

This approach aims to reveal more precisely the place of adjectives in the language system by taking into account not only their semantic but also their functional and syntactic properties.

Furthermore, studies advocating a broader approach to the classification of adjectives in Western linguistics are also noteworthy. For example, in the classification proposed by the linguist J. Nesfield, not only adjectives but also numerals and pronouns can be observed. This classification resembles more a classification of attributive determiners than of adjectives alone:

“1) proper adjectives: *a Chinese sailor, the English language*; 2) descriptive adjectives: *a brave boy, a dark night*; 3) quantitative adjectives: *much pain, little bread*; 4) numeral adjectives: *seven apples, few men*; 5) demonstrative adjectives: *this man, that boat*; 6) interrogative adjectives: *what book?, which book?*; 7) distributive adjectives: *each gun, every man*” [8:176-177].

It should be particularly emphasized that in the third, fifth, sixth, and seventh groups proposed by J. Nesfield, not only adjectives but also numerals (for example, *seven*) and pronouns (*this, that, what, which, each*) are included. This situation clearly demonstrates Nesfield’s functional approach to classifying adjectives based on their syntactic role in the sentence – namely, the function of modifying a noun. In other words, the scholar considered it appropriate to group together all linguistic units that perform the function of modifying a noun.

The analysis of the examined literature shows that there is no single, generally accepted approach to the classification of adjectives in English. While some researchers prefer classification based on the lexical-semantic properties of adjectives, others rely on grammatical and syntactic criteria. A third group of scholars adopts an approach that integrates both lexical-semantic and grammatical factors. This diversity indicates that scholarly consensus on the internal classification of the adjective category has not yet been reached in Western linguistics.

In Uzbek linguistics, the *O‘zbek tili grammatikasi* (Uzbek Grammar, 2019) devotes only ten pages to the adjective word class, and this source does not provide specific information regarding the internal grouping and classification of adjectives. Nevertheless, the manual contains valuable observations concerning the syntactic position of adjectives, their substantivization potential, and their combinatory properties with other word classes. In particular, the grammar emphasizes that adjectives, as a result of substantivization, can perform syntactic functions that are not typical for them: “Adjectives are used in the plural meaning to denote all or a group of persons.” As a result of the substantivization process, adjectives acquire the meaning of a person or object and can perform syntactic functions characteristic of nouns – for example, the function of an object or subject. The following example serves as evidence:

Immediate help was rendered to the sick. (Kasallarga shoshilinch yordam ko‘rsatildi.)

In the given sentence, the adjective *sick* acquires the meaning “the sick people” as a result of substantivization and functions as an object. This case clearly illustrates the functional flexibility of adjectives and their ability to shift between word classes.

References:

1. Сидоркин К.А., Анализ научных подходов к классификации прилагательных английского языка в отечественной и зарубежной литературе // Евразийский Союз Ученых (ЕСУ) № VIII, 2014. – С.122-125.
2. Виноградов В. В. Русский язык (Грамматическое учение о слове): Учеб. пособие для вузов // Отв. ред. Г.А. Золотова. – 3-е изд., испр. – М.: Высш. шк., 1986. – С.172. (– 640 с.)
3. Харитончик, З.А. Имена прилагательные в лексикограмматической системе современного английского языка // З.А. Харитончик. – Минск: Вышэйшая школа, 1986. – 94 с.
4. Хаймович Б.С., Роговская Б.И. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка (на английском языке). – Москва: Высшая школа. 1967. – 298 с.

5. Каушанская В.Л. A Grammar of the English Language // Грамматика английского языка. – Москва: Айриспресс, 2008. – 381с.
6. Иванова И.П., Бурлакова В.В., Почепцов Г.Г. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. Москва: Высшая школа, 1981. – 285 с.
7. Турсунов У., Мухторов Ж., Раҳматуллаев Ш., Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили, – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи. 1992. – 399 б.
8. Nesfield J.C. English grammar, past and present. In 3 parts. Rev. in accordance with the views of the joint committee on grammatical terminology. – London: Macmillan, 1924. – P. 176-177.