

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**THE FORMATION OF PARADIGMS OF MORPHOLOGICAL UNITS WITH THE
HELP OF SEMANTICS INTENSIFICATION/DEINTENSIFICATION*****Ikhtiyorov A'zamjon****Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology**Kokand State University**Kokand, Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: Intensification, antonym, norm, comparative degree, ordinary degree, normative degree, superlative degree, regressive degree.

Received: 01.05.26**Accepted:** 02.05.26**Published:** 03.05.26

Abstract: It is known, in the adjective, verb and number categories, there are also special morphemes (specific to these categories) used to weaken the meaning, but in adjectives, weakening the meaning of the word is more related to the degree of quality. The grammatical category associated with intensity/deintensity in morphology is the category of degrees of quality. Various 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 various views.

Introduction. It is known that, the role of morphemes in the realization of semantics intensification/deintensification is of particular importance. The classification that has become customary in Russian and Uzbek linguistics so far: the terms ordinary (positive degree), comparative degree (comparative degree) and their meanings absolutely do not meet the requirements of scientific classification. In particular, the terms ordinary (positive) and comparative degree do not reflect the type of quantity associated with comparison. They do not have the concept of the number or number of signs derived from the norm.

Methods. According to the results of our research, it is worth recognizing that word-forming and form-forming types of morphemes in languages actively participate in the

realization of this semantics: for example, in English, affixal morphemes: 1) -un: untiring, unprecedented, unlimited, uncurbed, unbridled; 2) -in: invincible, incurable, indivisible, invincible, incurable; 3) -ly: continuously, totally, completely, overwhelmingly, endlessly; 4) -less: fearless, heartless, endless, lifeless, reckless; 5) -im: immortal, immortality, immature; 6) super-: supersonic, superordinate, supernatural, superintendent, supersoldier; 7) hyper-: hyperphoneme, hyperconcept, hypercorrect; 8) ultra-ultraviolet; 9) archi-: archbishop, archangel, archicomplex; 10) extra-: extraordinary, extralinguistic; 11) all-: all-might, all-mighty; 12) ever-: evergreen, ever-present, ever-frozen, ever-more-demanding; 13) ear-: ear-splitting, man-killing; 14) war-: war-stricken; 15) poverty-: poverty-stricken; 16) never-: neverending; 17) non-: non-grata, non-flying zone, non-stop service, non-stop train; 18) no-: no-load, no-go, no-go area, no-fly area; 19) multi-: multi-millionaire, multi-profile; 20) high-: high-pitched, high-power; 21) sky-: sky-high prices, sky-high wages, sky-rocketing; 22) top-: top-secret, top-ranked, top-ranking, top-rank; 23) best-: best-selling, best-looker, best-in-class, best-fit-extrapolation, best-case value; 24) all-: all-age mortality, all-around bending, all-around looking antenna, all-Russian; all-to-all; 25) dead-: dead-beat, dead-burn, dead-end, dead-ripe; 26) over-: overripe, overactive, overambitious, overcareful, overripe; 27) out-: outswim, outfight, outrage; 28) top-: top-class, top-hole idea, top-of-the-line machine, etc.;

in Uzbek: 1) be-: bemehr, behad, beraxm, bekamiko'st, behimor, bearmon, betinim, betashvish; 2) ba- batamom, bakuvvat, ba'mani; 3) ma+s tolmas, o'lmas, charchamas, qo'rqmas, yengilmas, kaytmas, bitmas-tuganmas; 4) -siz: sanoqsiz, cheksiz, chegarasiz, boshovsiz, quloqsiz (bola), yuzsiz, uyatsiz, havosiz, tilsiz, unsiz, to'xtovsiz, tinimsiz, uzluksiz, to'xtovsiz, davosiz, tengsiz, ayovsiz, yuzsiz; 5) -larcha: minglarcha, millionlarcha yuzlarcha, minglab, millionlab; 6) -ma+y+digan: bo'linmaydigan, bo'ysunmaydigan, tugamaydi-gan, yengilmaydigan, qaytmaydigan, tinchimaydigan, uzulmaydigan; 7) takror shakl qo'poldan-: qo'poldan-qo'pol, qaysardan-qaysar, uzundan uzun; 8) qo'yarda-: qo'yarda-qo'yimas, borarda-bormas; 9) -day: tog'day, oyday; 10) -dek: arslondek, tulkidek; 11) -siz+larcha: quloqsizlarcha, yuzsizlarcha, aqlsizlarcha, uyatsizlarcha; 12) -g'ayri: g'ayritabiiy, g'ayriqonuniy, g'ayridin, g'ayritabiat; 13) intensiv shakl: ko'm-ko'k, qup-quruq, yap-yalang, qip-qizil, qop-qora; 14) -ma (ravish yasovchi): ko'chama-ko'cha, dalama-dala, to'yma-to'y, bog'ma-bog', tog'ma-tog', va h.k.; 15) juft shakl: yoshu-qari, kattayu-kichik, do'stu-dushman, boshi-keti, erkagu-ayol, eru-xotinlar; xotin-xalajlar, yoru-do'stlar, yoru-birodarlar, bola-chaqalar, xotin -qizlar, yosh-yalanglar va h.k.

In addition to the above morphemes, their Uzbek morphemes such as '-cha, -loq (a-loq), '-lar', '-cha, day/dek, -la-, kila-', as well as Russian morphemes such as and others are widely

used to enhance the meaning. Some of them should be briefly discussed, because nouns have the form-forming affixes -cha, -loq (a-loq), which are associated with intensification/deintensification. Compare: girl (older) - girl (younger). These additions can also express a subjective value arising from the meaning of smallness: If you have seen a patient, I will answer you, young man (H. Nazir). In the Uzbek language, the semantics of intensification/deintensification is based on the number category of nouns. Compare: book (singular) - books (plural). The meanings of the -lar affix are very diverse, and it serves to strengthen the meaning in the following cases: 1) the meaning of respect for the person himself is strengthened: Here are the grandfathers coming; 2) the meaning of respect for the person himself and things belonging to him is strengthened: Here are the grandfathers' tools; 3) the irony towards the person and other people around him is strengthened: The Ahmads are also gone!; 4) the suspicion or assumption is strengthened: Are the Kokands safe, brother?. 5) the emphasis is placed on the thing and other things around it, and their meanings are strengthened: The curds have also opened! The oils have also run out; 6) the meaning of the location is strengthened: Is this Anvarjan's? 7) the irony and challenge towards the person and those equated with him is strengthened: You will still see your day! 8) the emphasis on the thing, the person is strengthened: My heart is squeezed, may your tongues be cut off, may my heads be split open. 9) objects and persons are strongly exaggerated, exaggerated, emphasized: What could your mothers do! May your conscience be yours!; 10) the assumption, assumption is strengthened: I was already looking up at the sky (G. Ghulom).

In the Uzbek language, the meaning of the verb is also strengthened by adding the suffix -la-, kila-. For example: cho'qimoq - cho'qilamoq, ezmoq -ezg'ilamoq; tepmoq - tepkilamoq [2; 54].

Now, if we pay attention to the analysis of morphemes that express the semantics of deintensification on the intensity scale, in English, affixes such as micro-, mini-, sub-, -cub, tyny, minute, rare, low-, under- in nouns express the smallness of objects: a) micro+noun = microbiology - the science that deals with very small living things; micro+noun = microchip - a very small piece of silicon that contains the electronic connections for making a computer work; micro+noun = microfiche - a sheet of film with very small photographs of documents on it; micro+noun = microfilm - a piece of film that has very small photographs of documents on it; b) mini+noun = miniature - very small example or model of something that is usually much larger. Mini+noun = mini-market - a very small market. s) Sub+noun = subgroup - a small group of people who are part of a large group: We can divide the patients into two main subgroups. In the Uzbek language, there are also morphemes that express the semantics of deintensification,

for example: kamsuhan, kamnamo, kamgap, kikköngil, balasifat, koysifat, tovukmiya (man), befayz, befarosat, bemehr, bedayak, bebaht, betinim, behal, kuchsiz, madorsiz, etc.,

In the adjective, verb and number categories, there are also special morphemes (specific to these categories) used to weaken the meaning, but in adjectives, weakening the meaning of the word is more related to the degree of quality [1; 24]. In English, the suffix -ish is added to the adjective to be weakened, which corresponds to the additions ish/imtir in Uzbek, and in Russian it is оватый: red – qizil (красноватый)— reddish - qizgish, qizgimtir, och qizil (красноватый); green – yashil (зеленый) greenish - och yashil, yashilsimon (зеленоватый); yellow – saryq (желтый), yellowish – sarghimtir (желтоватый); blue – ko'k (голубой, синий) – bluish – ko'kimtir (синиватый); white – oq (белый), whitish – oqish, oqimtir (беловатый); black – qora (черный), blackish – qoramtir (черноватый). Daladan ilon izi bo'lib ketgan oqish yo'lining ufqida bir nima yilt etdi (M.Ismoiliy. Farg'ona tong otguncha. 89-bet); (The stream that left the field like a snake's trail shone on the horizon of the road (M.Ismailiy. Fergana tong atgunsha. p. 89).

The grammatical category associated with intensity/deintensity in morphology is the category of degrees of quality. Various 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 various views [3; 32]. The general (categorical) meaning of the category of degrees of comparison of adjectives is sign quantities. The specific meanings of this category are formed by quantitative types related to comparison. Each specific meaning has its own form. Different views in general linguistics, Turkology and Uzbek linguistics mainly concern the specific meaning types of the category of degrees of comparison of adjectives and their mutual relationship.

Results and discussion. According to A.G. Eyvazov, in linguistics, degrees of comparison of adjectives are classified as follows: a) the presence of one degree of quality in two objects; b) the expression of the degree of quality of quality without comparison, without comparison; c) degree of increase; degree of decrease and degree of increase; comparative and increase; equal, identical degree of quality in two objects, excess of one object sign over another object sign, the (highest) degree of comparison of one object sign to another, the highest (bordering) degree without comparison of one object sign to another; degree of equality of two object signs, increased degree, degree of non-compliance, increased degree, most increased degree.

I. group: intensive, diminutive degree, uncomparable degree, comparative degree.

II. group: degree of equality of a sign in two subjects, comparative, superlative degree, comparative superlative degree. Professor J. Denis distinguishes only one degree, that is, superlative degree. There are also the following classifications: comparative and superlative; comparative, diminutive, superlative; equally strong, comparative, superlative, intensifier. A.G. Eyvezov, having shown his attitude to the above classifications, divides the degrees of adjective into the following types: simple (positive), comparative, superlative, intensifier (intensive), diminutive, superlative (superlative).

In Uzbek linguistics, degrees of adjective are also classified differently: superlative, diminutive, comparative; simple, superlative, diminutive; diminutive, superlative; simple, comparative, decrease, increase;

G. Khoshimov proposes to divide color adjectives into four degrees: 1) regressive degree: redish; 2) ordinary degree: red; 3) comparative degree: redder; 4) superlative degree: the reddest/very red [9; 154-158].

O. Bozorov analyzes the degrees of adjectives logically (logically, cognitively). For this purpose, he analyzes the issues of the categorical sign of the category (paradigm) of degrees of adjectives, their specific meanings, their relationship, important features taken for classification, forms of specific meanings, and their relationship to adjacent phenomena [2; 38].

O. Bozorov expresses his thoughts on the positive degree - comparative degree - superlative degree accepted in European and Russian linguistics. According to him, the classification that has become customary in Russian and Uzbek linguistics so far: the terms ordinary (positive degree), comparative degree (comparative degree) and their meanings absolutely do not meet the requirements of scientific classification. In particular, the terms ordinary (positive) and comparative degree does not reflect the type of quantity associated with comparison. They do not have the concept of the number or number of signs derived from the norm. From this point of view, only the term superlative degree justifies itself. It has an opposition (opposition, difference) to the norm and the demonstrative degrees. According to the researcher, the content center (basis) of the category of degrees of quality is the normative (usual) degree of the quality sign. Other degrees should be determined relative to this center. More precisely, the gradation of a sign occurs in two directions from the norm, that is, in increasing and decreasing directions: demonstrative degree ← normative degree → superlative degree. The terms (terms) should also correspond to this [2; 45]. According to O. Bozorov, the terms “ordinary degree” in the Uzbek language and “positive degree” in the Russian language do not meet the logical (content) requirements. The word “ordinary” is an antonym of the complex word and is a concept related to structure. The term “comparative degree” has nothing

to do with the concept of quantity at all. It means a syntactic construction in which the subject sign is compared, and does not directly mean the degree of the sign formed in this construction [2; 48].

Thus, according to O. Bozorov, the category of degrees of comparison is a paradigm with a three-membered opposition (diminutive degree - normative degree - superlative degree).

As is known, in recent works, the intensifiers of the adjective (along with intensifiers such as *eng*, *juda*, *g'oyat*) include intensifiers such as *kap-katta*, *qip-qizil*, which arose on the basis of repeated words, and deintensifiers such as *bir oz*, *sal*, as well as adjective forms such as *ko'kish*, *kokimtir*, *qizg'ish*, *sarg'ish*.

O. Bozorov objects to this. In his opinion, there is a difference between them: intensifiers such as: *juda*, *eng*, *g'oyat* are used in contexts of clear, obvious comparison; deintensifiers such as *-ish*, *-imtir* are used in speech conditions where the comparison is not clearly visible. Therefore, they are separated from the category of adjective degrees in traditional textbooks and manuals and are given under the name "intensive forms of the adjective." [2; 50].

Conclusion. In short, in his research, O. Bozorov expresses relevant scientific ideas about the structure, classification, important features, and relationship of the category of degrees of comparison of adjectives to related phenomena. Nevertheless, his views cannot be considered very complete. For example, from the classifications in the cited literature, we can learn that there is also a degree of equality of the quality sign in language (in different languages). We can see this in the construction of two things with the same degree of color sign. Also, O. Bozorov limits himself to saying degrees of intensification and decrement [2; 52].

In reality, intensification/deintensification (degrees of intensification, degrees of decrement) starting from the norm also has different stages (levels). That is why in some literatures, internal gradations are also noted, such as degrees of intensification, the highest level of intensification, and the ultimate limit of intensification.

References:

1. Эйвазов А.Г. Степени имен прилагательных в современном турецком литературном языке (с привлечением материалов из других тюркских языков): Автореф. дисс. ... канд.филол. наук. – Баку. 1964. – С. 5-9.
2. Bozorov O. Graduonomy in Uzbek. - Tashkent: Science, 1995. - B. 28.
3. Galkina-Fedoruk E.M. On expressiveness and emotionality in language: Sat. Art. in linguistics. – M.: Nauka, 1958. – P. 24.

4. Галеева И Ф. Интенсивность и экспрессивность как основные характеристики рекламного текста. – М.: Наука, 1998. - 192 с.
5. Egorova V.N. On the issue of determining intensity in modern linguistics. Bulletin of the Nizhny Novgorod University, 2009. No. 6 (2). – pp. 224 - 226.
6. Kadyseva S.S. Category of intensity in the system of functional-semantic, functional-stylistic categories. News of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences. T. 12, No. 5. 2010. – P. 198.
7. Rodionova S.E. Intensity and its place among other semantic categories / S.E. Rodionova // Slavic Bulletin. Vol. 2. – М.: MAKS - Press, 2004. – P. 303.
8. Sheigal E.I. On the relationship between the categories of intensity and expressiveness // Theoretical issues of English philology (lexicology). – М., 1987. – P. 65 - 74.
9. Хошимов Ғ.М. Турли тизимли тилларда сифат даража категориясининг қиёсий-типологик назарияси ва таржима муаммолари // Чет тилда маданиятлараро мулоқотни ўргатишнинг долзарб масалалари. Илмий –таълимий анжуман материаллари. – Тошкент. 2017. – Б. 154 – 158.