

STYLISTIC FEATURES OF ADVERBS AND ADJECTIVES, VARIANCE AND SYNONYMIC FACTORS IN THEIR EMERGENCE

Akida Khasanova Rakhimjon kizi

Assistant, University of Economics and Pedagogy, NOTM, Andijan

Article information:

Manuscript received: 05 May 2025; **Accepted:** 06 Jun 2025; **Published:** 12 July 2025

Abstract: This research explores the stylistic features of adverbs and adjectives, focusing on their role in enriching language expressiveness and emotional coloring. The study examines how adverbs and adjectives contribute to tone, mood, and intensity in both spoken and written discourse. Special attention is given to variance in usage across contexts, as well as the emergence of synonymic forms shaped by stylistic needs. The research analyzes how these parts of speech enhance descriptive quality and support stylistic diversity. Findings highlight their crucial role in literary, journalistic, and conversational styles, emphasizing their flexibility and semantic depth.

Keywords: Adverb, style, feature, grade, form.

Introduction.

Language is the most essential tool for human communication, culture, and cognition, and its richness and diversity have always been a focal point for linguists and literary scholars. Among various parts of speech, adjectives and adverbs hold a special place because they enhance the expressiveness and vividness of communication. Adjectives describe the qualities and characteristics of nouns, providing detailed information about objects, persons, or concepts, while adverbs modify verbs, adjectives, or other adverbs, specifying the manner, time, place, degree, cause, and other aspects of actions or qualities.

This study focuses on the stylistic features of adjectives and adverbs, exploring their unique roles and multifunctional nature in discourse. From a stylistic perspective, these parts of speech do not merely convey semantic content but also enrich the text or speech by adding emotional coloring, tone, and intensity. The choice of particular adjectives or adverbs, especially among synonyms, can significantly affect the style, mood, and communicative effect of a message. The emergence and use of synonymic variants in these categories often reflect stylistic preferences, social contexts, and the need for nuance and precision in expression.

Variance in the usage of adjectives and adverbs is another important factor influencing their stylistic functions. Depending on the context, genre, and communicative situation, these words may change in form, frequency, and meaning to create different stylistic effects. For instance, the simple, everyday adjectives and adverbs found in casual conversations contrast sharply with the complex, layered synonymic structures typical of literary or scientific texts. Understanding this stylistic variability is crucial to appreciating the flexibility and richness of language.

Moreover, the study of adjectives and adverbs from a stylistic and synonymic perspective is an area that has not been exhaustively explored in linguistics. Identifying the stylistic roles of these parts of speech and analyzing their synonymic networks help reveal the emotional and expressive potential of language. This research contributes to the growing interest in lexical stylistics, focusing on how lexical units function within different communication types and how they shape the aesthetics and effectiveness of language use.

This paper examines the stylistic features of adjectives and adverbs, their variance, and the synonymic factors influencing their emergence and selection. The findings aim to deepen the understanding of the expressive resources of language, preserving and developing its stylistic diversity. Furthermore, this study may provide theoretical support for language teaching, translation, and stylistic analysis, offering practical insights into how nuanced choices of adjectives and adverbs enhance communication.

Methodology and literature review.

R. Kungurov writes about the forms of subjective evaluation that express stylistic coloring: "All forms of subjective evaluation are mainly phenomena characteristic of oral speech. Such forms, frequently encountered in the language of a literary work, should also be considered as conditions characteristic of oral speech. Also, R.Kungurov evaluates the stylistic value of language units as follows: "The stylistic value of subjective evaluation forms is not limited to the fact that they create various subtleties of meaning, have an evaluative moment. Speaking about the stylistic features of this form, it is also necessary to talk about their use in an atypical context for themselves, their characteristics from the point of view of functional styles, and the issues of synonymy of forms of subjective evaluation with their place." The above two points of R. Kungurov serve as a basic theoretical idea for studying the functional and stylistic features of the adverb.

According to R.Kungurov, "the grammatical feature of functional styles is characterized by the fact that each functional style does not completely differ from the other in its specific grammatical feature. "There is no specific grammar for each functional style." Grammatical forms and categories are generally common to all styles. However, this does not lead to the conclusion that functional styles have no connection with grammar or grammatical stylistics. Because..."specific functional-stylistic delimitation (specialization) also encompasses any grammar. This is evident in two cases: firstly, the varying frequency of use of a particular form in functional styles, and secondly, the connection between the meaning of individual forms and specific functional styles. In particular, the second case is important, since the peculiarities of a particular style at the morphological stage are expressed in the same semantic-grammatical features of language units. Therefore, when studying the stylistic features of certain groups of means in a particular language, it is necessary to pay attention to its grammatical features.

At one time, A. Peshkovsky noted that the stylistic possibilities of morphological means are very limited. Our observations showed that A. Peshkovsky's opinion is valid. Not all units in a particular language acquire stylistic characteristics. This is also observed in the example of the research object of the work. In both Uzbek and English, the stylistic possibilities of adverbs and adjectives, the expression of connotative meaning, are limited in a certain sense. However, it is clear that some morphological means serve literally for stylistic coloring. This statement is supported by the following examples.

Result and discussion. If the lexical means characteristic of individual functional styles are clearly understood, then in the morphological system this feature is not noticeable. The general stylistic nature of the grammatical means related to it is also observed within the framework of adverbs. The adverb indicators used in each functional style operate within the framework of literary norms.

However, these statements do not negate the peculiarities arising in the use of adverbs and adjectives within the framework of functional styles. In the use of adverbs and adjectives, each style can show its own peculiarities. This is connected, firstly, with the lexico-semantic, emotional-expressive scale of the adverb and adjective group or the element denoting the sign. A lexical unit with these features can be characteristic of one of the functional styles, or the frequency of use in one style may be high, and vice versa, in another. This also applies to grammatical indicators within the category of adverbs and adjectives. In some styles, the use of individual adverbs and qualitative indicators differs in frequency.

Formal and scientific style requires the use of adverbs and adjectives based on strict literary language norms. The use of certain grammatical indicators, for example, *-only*, is not characteristic of this style at all. (There are more such indicators). If it occurs, it is perceived in a fixed state and is not used in the sense of expressiveness: Let's take the "dog" symbol in e-mail. The element dog in the word *-cha* in this sentence is not a form expressing a subjective assessment. It was adopted into the Uzbek language as a technical term in the form *kuchukcha*. (Puppy - horse).

A.N.Gvozdoev expresses the following attitude to this issue:..."the general rule on the absence of suffixes in this style of subjective evaluation, since these words are devoid of emotional coloring and the suffixes in them have lost their inherent meaning of diminutiveness or augmentation," that is, "there is reason for the absence of suffixes of subjective evaluation in this style, because these words are devoid of emotional coloring, do not express subjective evaluation, and the suffixes in them have lost the meaning of diminutive or augmentative."

A.N. Gvozdoev says the following about the literary style: "Bookish speech, which has a business character, is opposed to colloquial speech. It is characterized by a certain unnecessariness, the absence of special concerns about its accuracy," that is, "bookish speech, indicating the style of office work, is contrasted with colloquial speech. It has a certain convenience - there's no need to worry about achieving clarity of speech."

Also, A.Gvozdoev distinguishes the following in speech characterization, emphasizing the need to distinguish colloquial speech from ordinary speech: "conversational speech, prologue (different from each other)," that is, "prologue" is distinguished by the individual speech of the characters, goes beyond the norms of the literary language, is not characteristic of use in places other than the speech of the characters;

Conversational speech is contrasted with scientific and formal speech. Conversational speech is intellectual speech, expressive speech, emotionally colored. The scope of application is extremely wide, even encompassing artistic speech.

A. Gvozdoev explains morphological units with expressiveness and emotionality as follows: "Morphological means, having the character of expressiveness and emotionality, are limited in their use (as already indicated) by the fact that they do not find a place in strict business speech (laws, technical and scientific literature)," that is, morphological means with expressiveness and emotionality cannot find their place in the official style (laws, technical and scientific literature), therefore (as mentioned above) their use is limited.

Conclusion. The scholar includes diminutive- endearing suffixes among such suffixes: "To these means, first of all, belong the suffixes of subjective evaluation of nouns and adjectives, adverbs (*dom-domik, dlinnyy-dlenkiy, tixo-tixonko*)," that is, these means include, first of all, suffixes of subjective evaluation of nouns and adjectives: *uy-uycha, uzoq-uzoqkina, jim-jimgina*).

Speaking about stylistically colored units, he comes to the following conclusion: "Despite

the absence of complete clarity in the attribution of individual phenomena to one or another style, the existence of known branches characterizing individual styles is undeniable," that is, despite the lack of a clear criterion for assigning individual phenomena to a certain style, the existence of a certain branching characterizing individual styles is undoubted.

Literatures

1. Қўнғуров Р. Субъектив баҳо формаларининг семантик ва стилистик хусусиятлари. – Тошкент: Фан, 1980. – Б. 61.
2. Қўнғуров Р. Субъектив баҳо формаларининг семантик ва стилистик хусусиятлари. – Тошкент: Фан, 1980. – 49.
3. Мурат В.П. Об основных проблемах стилистики. – М., 1957. – с.37.
4. Кожина М.Н. Стилистика русского языка. – М., 1977. – с. 128.
5. Пешковский А.М. Вопросы методики родного языка, лингвистики и стилистики. – М., 1930. – с.153.
6. Гвоздоев А.Н. Очерки по стилистике русского языка. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1955. – 464 с. – С. 138.
7. Гвоздоев А.Н. Очерки по стилистике русского языка. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1955. – 464 с. – С. 140.
8. Гвоздоев А.Н. Очерки по стилистике русского языка. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1955. – 464 с. – С. 142.
9. Гвоздоев А.Н. Очерки по стилистике русского языка. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1955. – 464 с. – С. 144.