

**COGNITIVE ANALYSES THE CATEGORY OF DEGREES OF COMPARISON OF
ADJECTIVES IN NON-RELATED LANGUAGES****Ziyaev Avazjon**

Doctor of Philological Sciences, professor Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Ixtiyorov A'zamjon

A teacher of the faculty of foreign languages Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT: This article touches upon degrees of comparison of adjectives established for the first time in Modern English, Uzbek and Russian, which allowed the author to reveal the universal features of the verbalizers and the factors preconditioning the latter. A grammatical category related to intensification/deintensification in morphology is the category of degrees of comparison. Different views have been put forward in linguistics about the semantic-morphological nature of this category.

Key words and expressions: degrees of comparison of adjectives, positive degree comparative degree, superlative degree, norm, comparison, ordinary, subordinate, superordinary.

Introduction

It is known that the basis of the whole universe is things and their relations. Things are characterized by internal processes and actions in relation to other things. As a result of these actions, things undergo internal changes, or one thing loses its identity and becomes (transitions) another thing. Everything has a certain quantity and quality that makes it what it is. There is a standard quantity and quality of everything. A decrease or increase in the standard amount of a thing in a thing causes different states of the thing. If the quantity of a thing goes beyond its certain limits of smallness or abundance, then something else has been created from this thing.

For example, when water is in vapor or ice state, it (water) has different states. But in H₂O, H or O dissociation from the norm (H₃O, H O₂) causes water loss or other chemical phenomenon. So, the movement and change of a thing is related to the quantitative and qualitative characteristics that make it up. All these processes are reflected in the language. As a result, a category of quality (sign, feature) levels is formed in a person's mind (thought) [1; 12-15].

Main body

First of all, before studying the peculiarities of the character leveling category of the adjective word group, which is characteristic of all languages, in different systematic languages, we should determine the logical-cognitive, reference state of this category in an appropriate (adequate) way, and then we should study the aspects of difference. For this, it is necessary to logically cognitively interpret the category of quality levels, to correctly determine its essence.

As in any category, the grammatical category of adjectives has general and specific meanings. In order to be a grammatical category, specific grammatical meanings must be connected to one general meaning or one general meaning must be branched into specific meanings, and each specific meaning must have its own form (specific form). Such a system is called a grammatical category. So, the logical basis of the category of degrees of comparison

is the general grammatical meaning (character), specific grammatical meanings, and their opposition.

A grammatical category related to intensification/deintensification in morphology is the category of degrees of comparison. Different views have been put forward in linguistics about the semantic-morphological nature of this category.

Since this category is directly related to our research, we will dwell on it in detail and show our attitude to different views. The general (categorical) meaning of the category of quality levels is sign quantities. The specific meanings of this category are the quantitative types related to comparison. Each specific meaning has its own form. Different views in general linguistics, Turkology and Uzbek linguistics are mainly related to specific meaning types of quality category and their interaction.

According to A.G. Eyvazov, quality levels in linguistics are classified as follows: a) presence of one character level in two subjects; b) a disproportionate, incomparable expression of the level of character acquisition; c) additional degree; decreasing degree and increasing degree; comparative and accretive; equal, same sign level in two subjects, excess of one subject sign over another subject sign, (highest) degree of attribution of one subject sign to another, highest (borderline level) of one subject sign incomparable to another; degree of equality of two subject marks, increased degree, inferior degree, increased degree, most increased degree [7; 5-6].

I - group: intensive, diminutive degree, non-comparative degree, comparative degree.

II -group: degree of equality of two subjects, comparative degree. Professor J. Deny distinguishes only one degree, that is, the superlative degree. The following classifications are also found: comparative and superlative; comparative, decrease, increase; equal strength, comparative, increase, increase. After showing his attitude to the above classifications, A.G. Eyvezov divides the degrees of quality into the following types: simple (positive), comparative, increasing, intensifying (intensive), decreasing, increased degree [7; 7-9].

In Uzbek linguistics, degrees of comparison also classified differently: superlative; positive, comparative, comparative; positive, comparative, decrease, increase;

Professor G'. Khoshimov proposes to divide the qualities expressing color into four levels: 1) regressive degree: reddish; 2) positive degree: red; 3) comparative degree: redder; 4) superlative degree: the reddest/very red [6; 35-39].

Professor O. Bozorov analyzes quality levels logically (logically, cognitively). For this purpose, he analyzes the issues of the categorical sign of the category (paradigm) of quality levels, their specific meanings, their relationship, the important signs taken for classification, the forms of specific meanings, and their relationship to related phenomena [1; 54-56].

O. Bozorov comments on the accepted ordinary level - comparative level - additional level in European and Russian linguistics. He said that the traditional classification in Russian and Uzbek linguistics: the terms simple (positive degree), comparative degree and their meanings do not meet the requirements of scientific classification. In particular, the terms simple (positive) and comparative degree do not in themselves reflect the type of quantity related to the comparison. They do not have the concept of the smallness of the sign taken from the point of view of the norm. From this point of view, only the term incremental degree is justified. It has an opposition (contrast, difference) to the standard and the minor degrees [1; 58-61].

The researcher says that the content center (base) of the category of quality levels is the normative (usual) level of the quality indicator. Other levels should be determined relative to this center.

Now let's move on to the analysis of their relationship between form (nomeme) and meaning (sememe).

Positive degree in Uzbek / Russian / English is called "ordinary degree - positive degree - comparative degree - superlative degree. (See: Ilyish 1965, 62-69; Leach 1983; 172-175; Quirk 1982, 108-129; Ghulomov 1955, 42- 43; Kononov 1960, 160-165, etc.).

I. Turansky uses the term "ordinary" here. Logically, the concept of "simple" should be contrasted with the concept of "complex", which cannot reflect such meanings as "quantity level" and "sign quantity type" [9; 24-26].

The meaning of the term "positive degree" in the Russian language is not connected with the concept of quantity. It is actually related to the content of the relationship (positive/ negative). The term "positive" in the English language is the same or a doublet of the Russian ". At this point, we should say that the term "ordinary" in the system of ordinary- subordinate - superordinary used by I. Turansky is somewhat close to the meaning of "normal" level. Its meaning refers to the concepts of "usual", "normal". We can also note that the concept of "normal" does not represent the central "norm" between reduction and increase [9; 27-30].

The decrease and increase of the zero mark (absolute decrease and absolute increase) can be at a different point of the degree scale than the norm. For example: This apple is redder than the one, and the next one is redder than the one (the points of comparison are changing).

As can be seen from the above, the term "ordinary" used by I. Turansky corresponds to the logically appropriate concept of "normal" category of quality levels in Uzbek, Russian and English languages.

The terms comparative degree are found in Uzbek, Russian and English grammars. These terms also do not represent character level types in their lexical sense. In fact, the concept of "comparative" is not the degree of sign (little, moderate, much), but the name of the method or method (comparative method) used to determine these degrees.

So, in our opinion, degrees of comparison of adjectives in English, Russian and Uzbek languages must be in this way: **ordinary- subordinate – superordinary**.

There are different opinions about the meaning of the affix *roq*, that is the indicator affix of comparative degree in the Uzbek language.

According to A.I. Kononov and N.K. Dmitrev, the affix *-roq* is an indicator of comparative degree, which serves to strengthen or weaken the meaning.

V. Radlov, J. Denu, V. Bani say that the affix *-roq* originates from the ancient Turkic word *iraq/yiraq* (daleki). Linguists such as N.K.Dmitrev, A.M.shcherbak, A.Gulomov, I.A.Kisin, B.Musikov, A.Rafiev also admit that the affix *-roq* has the meaning of strengthening and weakening the sign.

Z. Marufov and A. Nurmonov express an opinion that the affix *-roq* only weakens and reduces the meaning. It seems that there are two different views about the meaning of the affix *-roq*.

Z. Marufov conducted a special research on quality levels, meaning characteristics of *-roq*. Therefore, in order to know the truth about the meaning of the affix *-roq*, we pay attention to Z. Marufov's views. According to Z. Marufov, the affix *-roq* has only one meaning. It only

indicates the weakness of the sign being compared. Compare: The girl with long hair has come - The girl with longer hair has come in the construction - roq indicates that the hair has not reached a lower, length state. Also, in the meanings of clean - cleaner, old - older, fat - fatter, the affix -roq means that the quantity of the sign is not up to the standard, low [5; 11-14].

In this case, the meaning of the affix -roq corresponds to the meaning "slightly", "a little". He says that in a comparative sentence like: Pear is sweeter than apple, it seems to reinforce the meaning of -more. In fact, this is not the case, because in such cases, the second quality sign receiving the suffix -roq is actually a comparative construction, the exit agreement form "from" or the elements "relative to, than" that come with the departure agreement are used to express that the next object sign is greater than the previous object sign. In other words, the meaning of superlative of the comparative construction is mistakenly considered as the meaning of unit (-roq) in this construction.

This can be clearly seen from the fact that if we remove the affix -rog from the above comparative construction, we will see that the meaning of the second object sign (adjective to which -rog is added) has increased from the previous one. : A good word is sweeter than a child, Shame is harder than death. Compare: Pear is sweeter than apple - Pear is slightly sweeter than apple [5; 14-18].

This alone means that -roq represents weakness, not excess. From these views of Z. Marufov, it is known that the meaning of the affix -roq cannot be determined in the abstract state (without context) like: tall- taller. Taken out of its context, it seems to indicate an increasing sign. Therefore, it should be mentioned that the use of -roq is related to two types of contexts: a) comparison of a concrete object sign with an abstract sign in a person's memory, that is, a usual, normative sign. In this case, -rog clearly means weakness.

A taller (not tall) building was seen in the distance; When used in a comparative construction, it reduces the redundancy of the two objects represented by the construction itself. Compare: A brother is taller than his little brother - A brother is a bit taller than his brother. "Tall" in the first sentence is a standard measure, and it means that the sign in the second subject does not reach this standard measure, i.e. "tall", smallness. In this case, the intensifier of very, most can be placed in front of the sign in the first sentence (very small, very small), and the deintensifier of a little can be placed in front of the second, i.e., the sign formed by -roq (such as slightly smaller, a little smaller) [5; 21-24].

So, it can be definitely said that the meaning of the affix -roq is "a bit", "a little", meaning smallness, and this meaning constitutes the grammatical seme of -roq. Misconceptions about the meaning of this affix in linguistics are the result of attributing the general meaning of the whole (construction) to the part (its element, in this case -roq), which has been shown many times in theoretical (general) linguistics, and coming to the wrong conclusion that the meaning of this element is. Generally, intensifiers/deintensifiers such as -more, very/extremely/extremely/most are tools that form paradigms of decreasing and increasing levels of adjectives.

In all literature, forms such as dark-black, crimson-red formed from the repetition (reduplication) of adjectives are recorded. The emergence of this formation is related to syntactic repetition. In this case, in our opinion, morphological repetition (reduplication), and intensive form (dark-yellow, dark-blue) emerged from morphological repetition. Dark-red (disconnect from the red-red of an apple) → red-red. (Detach from the red-red of the apple!)

→ crimson (Detach from the red of the apple!). In many works, the crimson form is said to be phonetically formed

This means that "dark" in dark-red is a syllable and it is formed by lowering and replacing the sound in the word red. At this point, we must say that the formation of red from red does not occur in the current speech situation. The young generation accepts the crimson form in the process of language learning, ready in such a state. So, the formation of crimson from red happened historically, not a product of current phonetic process.

Therefore, we should look at a part-part as a ready-made (taught) unit to a language learner.

On the other hand, the element dark- is not a morpheme that is added to at least two or three bases in the status of an affix. Taking this into account, we are in favor of viewing elements like qip (dark)- as an affixoid with an additional meaning (strengthening), that is, an element similar to an affix [3; 24-26].

The semantics of augmentative-reductive forms such as dark-blue and blue, although not dealing with a concrete comparison, is still in a weak associative connection with the normative level, based on it.

This shows that the enhancement level reddish – red – dark red is in a paradigm based on the three-membered opposition. These show that the comparative degree category of adjectives has its strong and weak paradigms. Even within the strong paradigm of comparative degree, one can find different cases of comparison. Concrete comparison occurs in constructions with the affix -harder: In the construction: Steel is harder than an iron, the things being compared (steel, iron) are given in the sentence structure.

The comparative members of the accrual level are not clearly visible in the sentence. Its intensification (very) comes from the context of the sentence in which it is used, in the form of an adjacent presupposition. For example, Bakhodir Jalolov is the strongest boxer in the world. It is given with a hidden comparison (to boxers in the world).

Conclusion

Therefore, when studying the category of quality levels in languages of different systems, it is necessary to perform the analysis based on the construction of the logical category, model of this category, and not on the description of the grammar of another language. After all, the objective content of the category of qualitative levels of the grammar of a particular, national language may be reflected and described by a subjective error. Special attention should be paid to the types of comparative content (explicit, implicit) that serve to express quality levels in the research process. Also, the role of the category of quality levels in the macro-category of intensification/dentensification, similarities and dissimilarities of formal and spiritual units should be researched.

Used literature

1. Bozorov O. Graduonomy in Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Science, 1995. 132 p.
2. Barkhudarov L.S. Essay on the morphology of the modern English language. M.: Higher school, 1975.
3. Gulyamov. A.G. Problems of historical word building of Uzbek language. Affixation, I. Word-formation affixes M., 1955. 124 p.
4. Kononov A.N. A grammar of modern Uzbek language. M.: Science, 1960. –p. 24-32

5. Marupov Z. Word formation. Noun and adjective. T., 1956. 87 p.
6. Hoshimov G'.M. Comparative-typological theory and translation problems of the degree category of adjectives in different systematic languages. Actual problems of teaching intercultural communication in a foreign language (Proceedings of the scientific-educational conference) T., 2017.
7. Eyvazov A.G. Degrees of adjectives in the modern Turkish literary language (with the involvement of materials from other Turkic languages): Abstract of the thesis. diss. ... Ph.D. Sciences. - Baku, 1964. - S. 5 - 9.
8. Ilyish B.A. The structure of modern English. Leningrad. 1965.
9. Turansky I.I. Semantic category of intensity in English. Monograph. - M.: Higher School, 1990. -173 p.
10. Leach GA. Communicative grammar of English. M., Prosveshenie, 1983. 198 p.
11. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leach G. A University grammar of English. M., Higher school. 184 p.