




RS Global
Journals

Scholarly Publisher
RS Global Sp. z O.O.
ISNI: 0000 0004 8495 2390

Dolna 17, Warsaw, Poland 00-773
Tel: +48 226 0 227 03
Email: editorial_office@rsglobal.pl

JOURNAL	International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science
p-ISSN	2544-9338
e-ISSN	2544-9435
PUBLISHER	RS Global Sp. z O.O., Poland
<hr/>	
ARTICLE TITLE	SEMANTICS OF ADVERBS IN THE LANGUAGE SYSTEM
AUTHOR(S)	Huseynova Tarana Akhmad, Huseynova Rena Kazım.
ARTICLE INFO	Huseynova Tarana Akhmad, Huseynova Rena Kazım. (2022) Semantics of Adverbs in The Language System. <i>International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science</i> . 4(36). doi: 10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30122022/7916
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30122022/7916
RECEIVED	06 December 2022
ACCEPTED	25 December 2022
PUBLISHED	30 December 2022
LICENSE	 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License .

© The author(s) 2022. This publication is an open access article.

SEMANTICS OF ADVERBS IN THE LANGUAGE SYSTEM

Huseynova Tarana Akhmad

Teacher, Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University (Shamakhy Branch) Language Literature And Their Teaching Technology

Huseynova Rena Kazım

Teacher, Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University (Shamakhy Branch) Language Literature And Their Teaching Technology

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30122022/7916

ARTICLE INFO

Received 06 December 2022

Accepted 25 December 2022

Published 30 December 2022

KEYWORDS

The Field of Morphology, The Formal-Morphological Criterion, The Formal-Morphological Approach, The Grammatical Boundary, The Adverb as an Independent Part of Speech.

ABSTRACT

It is the grouping of words that make up the vocabulary of the language on the basis of their meaning, form, and functions. It is considered parts of speech that words form various groups according to their semantic, morphological, and syntactic signs. In modern linguistics, parts of speech are classified into various: main (autocemantic) parts of speech: noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, verb, adverb; auxiliary (synsemantic) parts of speech: conjunction, particle; exclamation, imitative, and vocative words. The history of training on parts of speech is very ancient. According to Aflatun, according to ancient Greek scholars, who distinguished the verb from the names back in the fifth century BC, the sentence was corrected as a result of the connection of these names with the verbs. In Alexandrian period grammars, the amount of parts of speech has been increased to eight (name, verb, verb adjective, article, pronoun, adverb, affix, conjunction). In Alexandrian grammars, they have tried to interpret parts of speech morphologically rather than syntactically. In the linguistics of ancient times, the classification of parts of speech was actually subordinated to logic: parts of speech were identified with members of the sentence, which were considered equal to members of the sentence, hence the logical categories. However, at least in part in that classification, it was differentiated based on the presence of grammatical forms and meanings. Until the middle of the XIX century, parts of speech in linguistics were interpreted as a logical grammatical category. In the nineteenth century, linguistics in general, especially the field of morphology, developed a lot. During this period, many and various languages are studied, and as a result, the question arises: on the basis of what criteria it is necessary to classify parts of speech, are there differences in parts of speech in different languages, if so, what are they? At that time, the morphological principle was taken as the main criterion for parts of speech. Such a formal-morphological approach to the problem of parts of speech. It is characteristic of Jespersen's research. He considered parts of speech to be "formal groups of words", taking as the main criterion whether they have a verbal form or not. In this respect, he grouped the words as follows: words that are spoken, words that are conjugated, words that are not spoken, and words that are not conjugated.

Citation: Huseynova Tarana Akhmad, Huseynova Rena Kazım. (2022) Semantics of Adverbs in The Language System. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 4(36). doi: 10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30122022/7916

Copyright: © 2022 Huseynova Tarana Akhmad, Huseynova Rena Kazım. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY)**. The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Introduction.

At that time, along with the morphological criterion, the logical-syntactic criterion was also taken into account in distinguishing parts of speech. From a syntactic point of view, words with the same sentence member were considered the same part of speech. All words with the designation of example

were taken as adjectives. The formal-morphological criterion in determining parts of speech is not a satisfactory criterion. Because even when approaching parts of speech on the basis of a purely morphological form, a number of words devoid of form (particle, exclamation) remain outside the study.

Morphological signs of parts of speech are able to partially help to distinguish those parts of speech from each other but are not considered a general criterion for identifying them. These morphological (verbal) signs can be more or less applied in the division of parts of speech only in morphologically advanced languages (Indo-European languages, semi-languages, Turkish languages).

In Turkish languages, as well as in Azerbaijani, the category of adverbs is usually studied and studied based on the syntactic task, semantics or semantic morphological features that the word carries within the sentence. The syntactic principle arose as a result of mechanically applying, and transferring the grammatical laws of European languages to Turkish languages. According to this grammatical principle, all adjectives that precede a verb are also adverbs, regardless of the place of their use in the sentence. So, the syntactic principle actually removes the grammatical boundary that exists between adverb and adverb (morphology and syntax).

According to the semantic principle applied in the study of the adverb, all simple words denoting the quality, Sign, time, place of work or action, regardless of the place of their use in the sentence, are adverbs: ex. early (early), now (not at all), forward, together (together), Up (up), etc. Proponents of this principle consider all root words belonging to the adverb as nouns at the same time. So, the semantic principle also does not allow us to reveal the true essence of the adverb in our language.

Recently, there has been a tendency to study the adverb in Turkish languages on the basis of the semantic-morphological principle. According to this principle, it is not the place of use of the word in the sentence that is given to the fore, but the meaning of the dictionary, the ways of formation. This new principle allows more to determine the place of the adverb among other independent parts of speech. [13,144].

Research methodology.

The system of parts of speech has a historical character. This system was created and developed in connection with the development of human consciousness, is closely related to human thinking and is one of the most important language means of formation and expression of thought.

As human thinking developed, the need to express signs and qualities in various things also arose. When thinking became clear, it became necessary to use new words and means of expression. At a higher stage of the process of understanding the objective world, envelopes were formed. For example, in the epic "Kitabi-Dede Gorgud" the envelope is very small.

One of the aspects that prove that adverbs appeared later is that they were made from different parts of speech. So, there were already other parts of speech from which adverbs were made. For example, from nouns (opened in the morning-you come in the morning, fell in the evening-we come in the evening), adjectives (good student-reads well), numerals (two more than one-suddenly said), verbs (went running-went running). Adverbs have the general grammatical meaning that adjectives have, denoting a static sign. But the adverb denotes the sign directly, indirectly, indicates the sign of the sign (very beautiful, often speaking, more red, etc. By their origin, adverbs are words derived from adjectives (good, beautiful, elegant) and possessive words – nouns and pronouns. Adverbs began to denote, on the one hand, the sign of the action, that is, of the verb (often goes, runs hard), and on the other hand, the sign of the sign, that is, of the adjective (very good, most exalted).

The formation and development of the adverb as an independent part of speech is closely related to the development of other parts of speech. This grammatical category is regularly enriched and developed in the process of language development at the expense of new words, word combinations and idiomatic expressions; words belonging to other parts of speech, word combinations, phrases, even morphological signs weaken, partially or completely losing their first lexical-grammatical meaning. However, words that are separated from other parts of speech and move into the category of adverbs, become unstable and, being formed as a root word that is not decomposed into its component part, act as a word denoting the concept of an object, perform the task of a determining member or adjunct of a sentence, and in some cases even move away from the first and enter the other parts of speech. [15.84].

In modern linguistics, words are divided by linguists into a different number of groups according to form, meaning, connectedness and basic arrangement. Dealing with the grammar of the English language, Givon.T and Bauer.L [12,14] divide the words available in this language into fourteen groups according to form, function, meaning, connotation and basic arrangement; 1. Noun; 2. Adjective; 3. Pronoun; 4. Numeral; 5. Verb; 6. Adverb; 7. Stative 8. Modal words; 9. Prepositions; 10. Conjunctions; 11. Particle 12. Exclamations; 13. Articles; 14. Answer words (Yes, no). Another linguist Smirnitski A.Ā. on the other hand, classifies English words in terms of form, meaning, function and divides them into

twelve groups: 1. Noun; 2. Adjective; 3. Pronoun; 4. Numeral; 5. Verb; 6. Adverb; 7. Stative, 8. Modal words; 9. Prepositions; 10. Conjunctions; 11. Particle; 12. Exclamations; [8.104].

It seems to us that the most appropriate classification was given by Lyons J. [19.256]. He divides words into the following parts of speech according to their lexical meaning, morphological sign and syntactic function: 1. Noun; 2. Adjective; 3. Pronoun; 4. Numeral; 5. Verb; 6. Adverb; 7. Stative, 8. Modal words; 9. Prepositions; 10. Conjunctions; 11. Particle; 12. Exclamations;

Thus, parts of speech can be divided into three groups: 1) main parts of speech; 2) free parts of speech; 3) auxiliary parts of speech.

The first group includes noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, verb, adverb and case; the second group includes exclamation and modal words; and the third group includes article, preposition, conjunction and particle.

The parts of speech that exist in modern English differ from each other in their functions, meanings, means of expression in a sentence. The main parts of speech have an independent communicative function, answer a specific question, express certain members of the sentence and become independent members of the sentence. In addition, the main parts of speech have certain grammatical categories. [17.106].

Among the main parts of speech, one of the parts of speech that stands out for its specific features, stands out, has a wide scope is the adverb. In linguistics, the adverbial problem is one of the most controversial. So, since centuries, the concept of an adverb has made all linguists think and understand which group of parts of speech the adverb belongs to, how many types it belongs to, etc. the issues had led to disagreement and controversy among linguists. For Example, Sherba L.B included the adverb in the group of words that could not change and called it a "particle". [9.82] O. Jespersen also included the adverb in a group, sometimes with pronouns, considering it identical in meaning, form and function with prepositions, conjunctions and exclamations, [16.87]. Like the Lehrer A, he called the adverbs "particles". However, it would be a big mistake to accept this opinion. As we know, the adverb, like all the main parts of speech, has a communicative function, answers a certain question, expresses the member that is a member of the sentence, becomes an independent member of the sentence and has a certain grammatical category. [18.201]

Later, Russian linguists who took into account all these grammatical features of the adverb: A.I. Smirtinsky, B.A. Ilyish, V.Y. Plotkin, L.S. Barkhudarov includes the adverb in the group of the main parts of speech. After adverbs were included in the group of main parts of speech, this classification was also supported and approved by other linguists.

The historical approach to the study of language grammar allows the observation of transitional processes and phenomena that are also inherent in English. An example is the dual character of the infinitive, which has the signs of both a noun and a verb. Similar transitional, borderline cases have attracted the attention of many linguists.

So, Arnold I.B shows that each language has a large number of words, they are distinguished as a special degree, which in a complex case have a certain set of grammatical signs. On the periphery of this group are located other degrees and words – they have only some grammatical signs, however, other grammatical additions can also belong to them. [3.17]

Analysis of such borderline phenomena, namely after, before, since syncretism are the subject of this study. <<Syncretism would be advisable to start with the delineation of the concept.

The concept of syncretism. Syncretism – (the Greek word *synkretismus* means unification) - in the context of linguistics, various grammatical category VI means the identification of forms in one form. A direct impetus to the emergence of syncretism are certain phenomena of shifts (diversification) between the form and content of the unit. [1.70]

Syncretism is inherent in all levels of language and speech. The syncretism of the content plan is usually supported by the syncretism of the expression plan, since it is the corresponding formative expression of the synthesizing property present in the language. Some scholars attribute the concept of syncretism only to the paradigmatic of language and attribute it to irreversible systemic displacements in the process of language development. They are distinguished from contamination, diffusivity, which refers to the syntagmatic of language and living processes of the functioning of language units [6.102].

From this definition, it can be concluded that in linguistic studies, syncretism are often called grammatical homonyms or attribute them to the multifunctionality of the grammatical form of the word. As it is known, the question of grammatical homonyms in modern linguistics has not been sufficiently studied. However, grammatical homonyms are called words or their affixes that, while retaining that form, have different grammatical meanings. Thus, while polysemy and homonymy are distinguished in

lexicology, in grammar, the integrability of the dumb and the homonymy of the dumb are essentially synonymous [10.325].

Understanding of the degree of homonymy of the year is problematic. Homonymy relations between verbal affixes in the field of morphology of the English language, class homonymy of nouns, verb forms, word groups (classes) - adverbs and other parts of speech, the degree of homonymy between, conjunctions, exclamations and adverbs has been highlighted in linguists' studies.[4.64]

When homonymy is manifested at all levels above the level of phonology of the language, grammatical homonymy is characteristic of modern English, which may not have been adequately studied due to certain theoretical difficulties similar to those caused by lexical homonymy. Both types of homonymy have similarities: The coincidence of units with different meanings at the material (sound) level (in grammatical homonyms all semantic components of its items.);

Both types of homonymy are formed as a result of the action of divergence and convergence processes (divergence – as a diachronic process, leads to an expansion of diversity in the language system, the role of transformation of independent invariant units of essences with variants of one unit, or the formation of new variants of existing units occurs as a result of; convergence-as a historical unit. Homonymy units simultaneously exist alongside polysemantic units [11.38]. Looking at the problem of grammatical homonymy, two mutually exclusive approaches can be distinguished. According to the semantic approach. Parts of speech are divided into independent (Main) and service (functional) words according to their functional-semantic signs.

Formal-system approach to the theory of (L.Blumfield, A.I.Smirtinsky, L.S.Barkhudarov) parts of speech are divided into groups that change according to the formal (morphological) sign and do not change.

Palmer F.R believes that the form should be able to form an invariant meaning that remains common to all cases and is expressed in different contexts. When this is not possible, it is necessary to accept that seemingly overlapping forms are grammatical homonyms. From all these concludes that by Palmer F.R approach, homonymy and polysemy are not ontological concepts, but a conventional product of the research position, that is, he rejected the “objectivity” of these concepts [20.154].

In accordance with the second concept, the recognition of homonymy depends on the formal characterization of words included in this and other microsystem. Cruse. D notes that only in this case can one justify talking about the existence of these forms if in the group of words belonging to the same part of speech the differences in the variety of forms of homonymy are manifested in the group of words belonging to the same part of speech as in the group of words belonging, the principle of analysis of the systemic relationships of grammatical forms of the adverb allows identifying words marked with homonymy in a very specific form [13, 45].

These two approaches to grammatical homonymy not only differ from each other, they also lead to diametrically opposed consequences. A striking example of this can be seen in the example of a number of remarkable syncretism. The second principle is more convenient for studying the use of selected after, before, since syncretism, since each of these three words are unchanged words, but they can act either as the main part of speech (adverb) of the language, or as a service (apron and binder). As a criterion of homonymy, it is accepted that words belong to different parts of speech, while maintaining their material identity. Speaking of grammatical homonymy, it is important to remember the concept of the degree of neuroimaging of the degree of neuroimaging. In essence, this is a quantitative indicator of the exaltation of homonymy relations [15.81]. Thus, the absence of homonymy links gives information about the degree of homonymy equal to zero. The inclusion of homonyms in one class of words means that the degree is equal to one, the inclusion in two classes – the second degree, etc.

In our opinion, all these inaccuracies and certain contradictions of the traditional classification of words into parts of speech, as well as obvious differences between functions, relationships and the image of intonation, testify that we are not a word with a different function (for example, after), but precisely homonyms:

- After three months, after all my troubles(after – preposition)
- I have never seen him after (after – adverb)
- I have never seen him after he left the train (after – conjunction)

In addition, language traditions, in turn, make adjustments to the possibilities of using words with these and other functions. It can be agreed with kurakov that the full distribution and one-time delivery of functions in the system under the development and live action of the game is unnatural.

Similar syncretic derivatives are the result of diachronous and synchronous transitions, morphological methods of Word formation, and word construction by example. The reasons for their formation are conditioned by various factors – this is the need for the expression of any components of informative semantics at the expense of available language means. O. Espersen believes that it's a whole

lot of fun ... at the expense of inter-categorical substitution, the idea is liberated, and the expression becomes enriched and acquires a variety of shades. Therefore, the diachronic study of syncretisms after, before, and since is appropriate – to monitor the dynamics of the change of these units, and in particular, to pay attention to the relationship of time.

Of interest is the study of the grammatical status of these lexemes. Until now, the grammatical status of the lexemes after, before, since remains undetermined. Most anglists point to them as homonymic word aprons as conjunctions or adverbial patterns. In our opinion, the position is of interest: having analyzed the syntactic models that include the words after, before, came to the conclusion that these lexemes do not carry a binding futility. The designation of the words after, before, since through the syntactic models in which they are used is really of interest, since they are closely related to the syntactic application of their grammatical meaning due to the immutability of words and the absence of their paradigmatic order. In a number of cases, the crossing of parts of speech (especially the unchanging parts of speech) is based on syntactic signs as a whole.

Analysis of syntactic models of lexemes after, before, since and determination of their grammatical status. It is for this reason that it is advisable to distinguish models that include these lexemes with the help of the word classification.

Conclusions.

The article deals with the research of the linguistic item named as an adverb. The adverb is a word denoting circumstances or characteristics which attend or modify and action, state, or quality. It may also intensify a quality or characteristics. From the define adverbs as a class, because they comprise a most heterogeneous group of words, and there is considerable overlap between the class and other word classes. They have many kinds of forms, meanings and functions.

REFERENCES

1. Абаев В.И. Выступление на дискуссии по вопросам омонимии / В.И. Абаев // Лексикографический сборник, вып. IV. – М.: Гос. Изд-во иностранных и национальных словарей, 1960. – С. 71-76.
2. Ахманова О.С. Очерки по общей и русской лексикологии / О.С. Ахманова. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1957. – 294 с.
3. Арнольд, И. В. Семантическая структура слова в современном английском языке и методика ее исследования: дис. ... д-ра филос. наук / Арнольд И. В. – Л., 1966.
4. Виноградов, В. В. Русский язык: Грамматическое учение о слове / В. В. Виноградов. – М., 1972.
5. Кодухов В.И. Введение в языкознание: Учеб. для студентов пед. интов по спец. № 2101 “Рус. яз. и лит.” – 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. / В.И. Кодухов. – М.: Просвещение, 1987. – 288 с.
6. Потемня, А. А. Из записок по русской грамматике: в 4 т. / А. А. Потемня. – М.: Наука, 1959. – Т. 1.
7. Современный русский язык: учеб. для бакалавров / П. А. Лекант, Е. И. Диброва, Л. Л. Касаткин, Е. В. Клобуков; под ред. П. А. Леканта. – 5-е изд. – М.: Юрайт, 2013.
8. Смирницкий, А. И. Лексикология английского языка / А. И. Смирницкий. – М.: Изд-во лит. на иностр. яз., 1956.
9. Щерба, Л. В. Избранные работы по языкознанию и фонетике: в 2 т. / Л. В. Щерба; отв. ред. М. И. Матусевич; Ленингр. гос. ун-т им. А. А. Жданова. – Л.: Изд-во ЛГУ, 1958. – Т. 1.
10. Шмелев Д.Н. Очерки по семасиологии русского языка / Д.Н. Шмелев. – М.: Просвещение, 1964. – 425 с.
11. Яковлюк, А. Н. Лексико-семантический вариант как связующее звено между многозначным словом в языке и его реализацией в речи / А. Н. Яковлюк // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. Серия «Филология. Искусствоведение». – Челябинск, 2009. – Вып. 36, № 34 (172).
12. Bauer L. English Word-Formation / L. Bauer. – Cambridge, 1983. – 311 p.
13. Cruse D. Lexical Semantics / D. Cruse. – Cambridge: University Press, 1986. – P. 20-40.
14. Givon T. On Understanding Grammar / T. Givon. – NY: Academic Press, 1979. – 379 p.
15. Haspelmath M. From space to time: Temporal adverbials in the world’s languages / M. Haspelmath. – Munich & Newcastle: Lincom Europa, 1997. – 181 p.
16. Jespersen O. Essentials of English Grammar / O. Jespersen. – London, 1946. – 387 p.
17. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 256 p.
18. Lehrer A. Polysemy, Conventionality, and the Structure of the Lexicon / A. Lehrer // Cognitive Linguistics. – 1990. – P. 207-246.
19. Lyons J. Language and Linguistics. An Introduction / J. Lyons. – Cambridge, 1981. – 356 p.
20. Palmer F.R. Semantics. A New Outline / F.R. Palmer. – Cambridge: CUP, 1976. – 164 p.