

Functions of Adjectives in Sentences, Semantic Groups in Uzbek and English

MAYLIYEVA GULMIRA BAHRAMOVNA
Urgench State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the potential uses of adjectives in Uzbek and English, the process of substantivization of adjectives, the application of other parts of speech as adjectives, and the roles of adjectives functioning as nouns, adverbs, and participles in sentences. Uzbek and English are compared, their textual potentials are analyzed, and examples are provided from the Uzbek and English versions of Theodore Dreiser's novel Sister Carrie.

Keywords: Adjective, semantic groups, adjectives expressing value, adjectives expressing physical characteristics, adjectives expressing human propensity.

INTRODUCTION

In both Uzbek and English, adjectives are considered an independent part of speech and serve to describe qualities by expressing meanings such as color, size, taste, smell, character traits, and condition. However, these meanings are classified into different semantic groups in each language, and various approaches and classifications exist in this regard. Adjectives possess a derivational system morphologically, and they are also inflected and graded. From a syntactic perspective, adjectives maintain a fixed position within connected text, depending on their function. Their polysemantic and functional-semantic

features require dedicated linguistic investigation, as their contextual usage potential is vast and diverse.

While nine semantic groups of adjectives are distinguished in Uzbek, linguistic research in English has proposed classifications into 7, 11, or even 13 semantic groups. In Uzbek, the nine semantic groups of adjectives represent character traits, condition, size, color, taste, smell, shape, location, and time (Sodiqova 1974; Sayfullayeva, Mengliyev 2009). These semantic groups reflect the lexical meanings of qualitative adjectives and have been classified differently over time, as well as across different languages.

In English linguistics, the semantic groups of adjectives have been interpreted by various scholars, both in terms of their similarities to and differences from those found in Uzbek. It is particularly appropriate to begin with Dixon's classification, as it encompasses semantic groups that reflect the full range of lexical meanings attributed to adjectives.

Dixon initially categorized adjectives into 7 semantic groups, later expanded this to 11, and ultimately proposed 13 distinct semantic categories. These include adjectives expressing: value, dimension, color, physical property, human propensity, age, speed, qualification, quantification, similarity, position, cardinal numbers, and volition (Dixon 1982, 1991, 2004).

Among the semantic groups mentioned above, the most commonly occurring are those expressing value, physical properties, and human behavior. These groups correspond to the adjective categories in Uzbek that denote character traits and conditions. They describe the external, psychological, and economic states and characteristics of a person or object.

A key finding in the study of these semantic groups is that, due to the polysemous nature of adjectives and their diverse semantic functions in context, an adjective can simultaneously belong to multiple semantic groups depending on its contextual meaning. For example, the

adjective “delicious,” which typically denotes taste, may in certain contexts belong to the value group of adjectives, as in the sentence “You're so delicious” – meaning *Sen biramyoqimtoysan*.

In Uzbek, similar adjectives have been analyzed, and it has been identified that although an adjective may primarily belong to a specific semantic group, its meaning in context may align it with a different semantic group. For instance, expressions like *shirinhayol* (sweet thought), *balandovoz* (loud voice), and *oppoqorzu* (pure dream) demonstrate this phenomenon. This feature is considered one of the functional-semantic properties of adjectives, whereby their group affiliation may shift depending on their contextual function within the text.

Another important functional-semantic aspect of adjectives is their ability to occur in substantivized and non-substantivized forms in discourse. When substantivized, adjectives function as modifiers or determiners, predicates, genitive modifiers, vocatives, or even as adverbial elements. Substantivized adjectives take on nominal grammatical forms and function syntactically as nouns, although their lexical meaning remains adjectival. It is important to note that substantivized adjectives do not operate in combination with another noun but rather independently represent a nominal category and serve as naming units (Abdurahmonov 1950: 2). This is a phenomenon observed in both Uzbek and English.

Substantivization of adjectives refers to their syntactic function in a sentence when they perform the role of a noun. When the noun being described is omitted, the adjective adopts the morphological features of that noun and fulfills its syntactic function. Examples include:

- (a) Subject position: *Yaxshioshiniyer, yomon – boshini*.
(The good eat their food, the bad – their heads.)
- (b) Genitive modifier: *Saxiyningehsonigabaxilningboshiog'rir*.
(The miser envies the generous man's charity.)

- (c) Object: *Yaxshidanadashma, yomongayondashma.*
(Do not stray from the good, do not approach the bad.)
- (d) Vocative: *Azizim, dunyogabevaqtkelibmiz.*
(My dear, we have come into the world too soon.)

Adjectives can also be substantivized in the comparative degree, as in:

*Askarlaresaularningorasidanchaqqonroqlariniko'zostigaoli
bqo'ygandaybo'laredi.*
(The soldiers seemed to be keeping an eye on the quicker ones among them.)

In syntax, adjectives mainly function as attributive modifiers, nominal predicates, and sometimes as adverbials of manner. When they take on nominal categories, they may perform other syntactic roles. *Bechoralargayordamberishkerak* (The poor need help) – here, the adjective functions substantively. Examples:

- (a) Attributive modifier: *Ochilbuvaotkir, qorako'zli, serqoshchiroyliyigitbo'lgan.* (A. Muxtor)
- (b) Predicate adjective: *Gul qizil. Devoroq.*
- (c) Adverbial (manner or state): *U qizikularekan. Qobil bobo dardlixo'rsindi.* (A. Qahhor)

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a combination of comparative-descriptive methods, componential analysis, and dialectical approaches.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The scientific value of this article lies in its comparative exploration of the functional-semantic features of the adjective word class in two languages – Uzbek and English – with contextual examples drawn from texts in both languages. The analysis reveals that there exists a distinct semantic group of adjectives denoting character

traits, which includes adjectives that describe positive, negative, or neutral traits of a person or object (Ma'rufov 1957: 343).

We continue presenting the functional-semantic features of character-descriptive adjectives identified during the analysis:

- (1) *Senga sadoqatlibo'laman.* (I will be loyal to you.) The adjective *sadoqatli* (*loyal*) appears in the sentence as an attributive modifier.
- (2) *U Gerstvuddanaqliroq, Drueganisbatanbosiqroqvabilimdonroqko'rinar, aynipaydaqalbi ham go'dakqalbidaybeg'uboredi.*
(He seemed wiser than Herstwood, calmer and more knowledgeable than Drouet, and at the same time, his soul was as pure as a child's.)

Here, the adjective *bosiq* appears in various forms in the text: *bosiqlik* (calmness), *bosiqroq* (calmer), *bosiq* (calm), *bosiqlik* (calmness).

- (3) *U bironnarsabilanvijdonimnitinchitsamdeganidano' ziningadolatlitalablarigaDrueningbeparvovamensimayqara bkelayotganibungabahonabo'lgandi.*
(He hoped to ease his conscience with something, and Drouet's indifferent and dismissive attitude toward his fair demands became a justification for it.)
- (4) *Biroqbarchako'ngilsiznarsalarnitezdaunutibyuboradiganodamlar dekyuragiyengiltortibkeldi. Bu esajuda ham ko'ngilsizedi.*
(But like people who quickly forget all unpleasant things, began to feel relieved. Yet, this was very unpleasant.)
- (5) *Ana shuidoralargaaloqadorodamlarfaqatpulsanashuyaxshikiyinib, ekipajlardayurishdanboshqanarsanibilishmaydigangao'xshardi.*
(Those associated with those offices seemed to know nothing but counting money, dressing well, and riding in carriages.)
- (6) *Kordebaletdagilarsahnadagibundayishlaruchunjarimatushishi, gohoaybdorishdanbo'shatilishimumkinligini ham bilishardi; Shu kuygatushishigauningyakkao'ziaybdormikin?*
(The corps de ballet knew such actions on stage could lead to fines, and sometimes the responsible person could be dismissed. Was she solely to blame for her situation?)

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The main conclusion of this study is that adjectives in both Uzbek and English are used in largely similar syntactic functions across texts; however, they also differ in terms of their contextual possibilities. The comparative analysis confirms that adjectives in the two languages share both similarities and differences in their functional-semantic behavior. In conclusion, it is important to emphasize that within the system of parts of speech, the adjective occupies a distinct position. Words belonging to this class have undergone a long process of historical development. Semantically, adjectives denote qualities—more precisely, inherent and stable characteristics. This word class is rich in polysemy, which is closely related to its evolutionary development over time.

REFERENCES

1. Абдурахмонов Г. Субстантивированные прилагательные в современном узбекском языке: Автореф.дисс. канд.филол.наук. Самарканд. 1950. С. 2-3.
2. Buranov J. & Hashimov U. Ismatullayev H. English grammar (morphology, syntax). Т.: Ўқитувчи. 1974. 47 б.
3. Dixon R. M. W. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. Adjective classes, a cross-linguistic typology. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2004.
4. Dixon R. M. W. Where have all adjectives gone? And other essays in semantics and syntax. Berlin: Mouton. 1982.
5. Dixon R. M. W. A semantic approach to English grammar. – Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1991.
6. Маъруфов З. Сифат Ҳозиргизамонўзбек тили (лексикология, фонетика, графика ва орфография, морфология). Тошкент: ЎзФАнашриёти. 1957. Б. 343-357.
7. Teodor Drayzer. Baxtiqaro Kerri. Toshkent: Yangi nashr. 2019.
8. Theodore Dreiser. Sister Carrie. United States: Doubleday. 1900.

9. Содикова М. Ҳозирги ўзбекилидасифат. Т.: Фан. 1974.

MAYLIYEVA GULMIRA BAHRAMOVNA
INDEPENDENT RESEARCHER,
URGENCH STATE UNIVERSITY,
URGENCH, UZBEKISTAN.