

LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF SYNONYMIC SERIES, ANTONYMIC OPPOSITIONS, GRADATIONAL SCALING, AND EVALUATIVE OPPOSITIONS OF EMOTIONAL-EVALUATIVE ADJECTIVES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK**Valiyeva Navruzaxon Dilmurod qizi**

Teacher of Andijan State Technical Institute

E-mail: valiyevanavruza056@gmail.com**Abstract**

This article examines the paradigmatic properties of emotional-evaluative adjectives in English and Uzbek from a comparative perspective. The analysis focuses on synonymic series, antonymic oppositions, gradational scaling, and evaluative oppositions. The theoretical framework combines appraisal theory, paradigmatic semantics, and contemporary approaches to antonymy. The empirical basis includes *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati*, Izoh.uz, Sinonim.uz, and Antonim.uz for Uzbek, and Cambridge English Thesaurus, Cambridge Dictionary Grammar, and Merriam-Webster Thesaurus for English. The findings show that emotional-evaluative adjectives in both languages share a common axiological core, yet differ in semantic differentiation, expressive force, and pragmatic range. English tends toward stronger lexical differentiation, whereas Uzbek more frequently exhibits contextual expansion and expressive loading.

Keywords

emotional-evaluative adjectives, appraisal, synonymy, antonymy, gradation, evaluative opposition, English, Uzbek.

Introduction

Emotional-evaluative adjectives constitute one of the most active layers of the adjectival lexicon because they do not merely denote a quality of an object, person, event, or situation, but also encode the speaker's attitude, emotional response, and axiological judgment. For that reason, they should be examined not only as nominative units, but also as elements participating in relations of semantic proximity, opposition, scaling, and evaluative polarization [2; 1–27].

Within appraisal theory, evaluative meaning is structured through the interrelated resources of **attitude**, **engagement**, and **graduation**. Of these, **attitude** is especially significant for the analysis of emotional-evaluative adjectives, since it encompasses **affect**, **judgement**, and **appreciation**. **Graduation** explains how evaluation becomes stronger, weaker, sharper, or softer, which is why emotional-evaluative adjectives cannot be studied adequately outside the category of gradability [1; 42–69]. Hunston and Thompson, in turn, treat evaluation as a broad cover term for the expression of attitudes, feelings, and values in discourse [2; 1–27].

The aim of the present article is to analyze the synonymic series, antonymic oppositions, gradational scaling, and evaluative oppositions of emotional-evaluative adjectives in English and Uzbek. The study seeks to determine how these adjectives are organized within paradigmatic structure, how they differ in semantic and pragmatic force, and how they reveal common and language-specific axiological tendencies [4; 1–9].

Materials and Methods

The study draws on both theoretical and lexicographic sources. For Uzbek, the analysis relies on *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati* and the online resources Izoh.uz, Sinonim.uz, and Antonim.uz. The Academy-hosted edition of *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati* describes itself as a five-volume explanatory dictionary containing more than 80,000 words and word combinations; Izoh.uz presents itself as an explanatory resource with more than 35,000 entries; Sinonim.uz reports more than 3,300 words grouped into about 900 synonym sets; and Antonim.uz identifies itself as a site devoted to the collection and analysis of Uzbek antonyms [5], [6], [7], [8]. For



English, the lexical material was checked against Cambridge English Thesaurus, Cambridge Dictionary Grammar, and Merriam-Webster Thesaurus [9], [10], [11].

A balanced comparative working corpus of 100 emotional-evaluative units was formed for the two languages. The main selection principle was not strict translational equivalence, but **functional-semantic correspondence, axiological orientation, stylistic function, and gradational potential**. This procedure made it possible to examine synonymy, antonymy, and gradation as parts of one integrated paradigmatic system rather than as isolated lexical phenomena [3; 133–215].

The research methods include comparative-descriptive analysis, componential analysis, contextual analysis, and paradigmatic interpretation.

Results and Discussion

Positive emotional-evaluative adjectives in both languages form multi-layered synonymic rows. Their common semantic core may be described as approval, acceptance, esteem, and positive judgment; however, the members of the series differ in intensity, stylistic colouring, communicative function, and emotional charge. Therefore, synonymy in this field is not absolute identity, but proximity around a common semantic centre [3; 133–169].

In English, **good** functions as the central and relatively neutral unit of positive evaluation.

Synonymic series of negative evaluation

Negative emotional-evaluative adjectives likewise form a structured paradigmatic row. Their common semantic nucleus is associated with disapproval, rejection, unpleasantness, and in stronger cases disgust. Yet the members of the row do not carry equal negative force, which makes them especially important for semantic scaling and stylistic differentiation [3; 169–215].

In English, **bad** serves as the central negative unit, while thesaurus-based expansion leads toward **unpleasant, nasty, awful, horrible, and disgusting** [10], [11]. In Uzbek, **yomon** functions as the main central item, with **yoqimsiz, xunuk, jirkanch, rasvo, and qabih** representing increasingly sharper degrees of negative evaluation. Thus, the negative row may be schematized as **bad** → **unpleasant** → **nasty** → **awful/horrible** → **disgusting** and **yomon** → **yoqimsiz** → **xunuk** → **jirkanch** → **rasvo**. In both languages, the far end of the row usually carries heightened emotive and expressive tension [3; 169–215], [10], [11].

Antonymic oppositions

Antonymy occupies a central place in the paradigmatic organization of emotional-evaluative adjectives. Murphy treats synonymy and antonymy as key paradigmatic semantic relations, while Jones, Murphy, Paradis, and Willners show that antonym pairs are crucial for the structuring of contrast in discourse [3; 3–25], [4; 1–9].

In emotional-evaluative adjectives, antonymic contrast is axiological as well as denotative. Pairs such as **good – bad, pleasant – unpleasant, beautiful – ugly, and kind – cruel**, together with their Uzbek counterparts **yaxshi – yomon, yoqimli – yoqimsiz, chiroyli – xunuk, and mehribon – shafqatsiz**, express directly opposed assessments of the same object or phenomenon. Such oppositions reveal the polarized structure of the evaluative field [3; 169–215], [4; 1–9].

At the same time, these contrasts are often not rigidly binary. Cambridge Grammar notes that many pairs of opposite adjectives are **gradable**, which means that the opposition is organized along an open-ended scale rather than through an absolute either-or relation [9]. Consequently, between **good** and **bad**, or **yaxshi** and **yomon**, one may observe intermediate stages of evaluation. This explains why emotional-evaluative antonyms should be interpreted as polarized but internally scalar formations [1; 137–157], [9].

Gradational scaling

One of the defining features of emotional-evaluative adjectives is their gradability. In appraisal theory, this is explained through the resource of **graduation**, which governs intensification, weakening, and focal adjustment. Martin and White show that values of **affect**,



judgement, and **appreciation** are inherently gradable, and that gradation operates through force and focus [1; 137–157].

From this perspective, emotional-evaluative adjectives may be placed on clines such as “weaker–stronger,” “milder–sharper,” or “ordinary–extreme.” In English, the sequence **good** → **nice** → **lovely** → **wonderful/excellent** → **outstanding** represents ascending positive evaluation, while **bad** → **unpleasant** → **nasty** → **awful/horrible** → **disgusting** reflects increasing negative intensity. In Uzbek, the parallel sequences **yaxshi** → **yoqimli** → **ajoyib** → **zo‘r** → **benazir** and **yomon** → **yoqimsiz** → **xunuk** → **jirkanch** → **rasvo** demonstrate the same gradational tendency. Therefore, gradation is not merely a semantic feature; it is also a pragmatic mechanism that allows speakers to calibrate approval, admiration, rejection, or disgust more precisely.

Conclusion

The analysis demonstrates that emotional-evaluative adjectives in English and Uzbek form a complex paradigmatic system based on synonymic proximity, antonymic opposition, gradational scaling, and evaluative differentiation. Their semantic structure combines nominative meaning with subjective attitude, emotional colouring, and axiological judgment.

Positive and negative synonymic rows reveal the internal differentiation of the evaluative field; antonymic pairs show its polarization; gradation uncovers its scalar character; and evaluative oppositions expose its specialization across aesthetic, ethical, emotional, and functional domains.

The comparative perspective further shows that both languages share a common evaluative core, but they do not distribute semantic and pragmatic force in the same way. English more often relies on differential lexical segmentation, whereas Uzbek more readily activates contextual broadening and expressive loading. This makes emotional-evaluative adjectives a particularly productive object of comparative semantic and pragmalinguistic research.

References

1. Martin, J. R., White, P. R. R. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. pp. 42–69; 137–157.
2. Thompson, G., Hunston, S. “Evaluation: An Introduction.” In: Hunston, S., Thompson, G. (eds.) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. pp. 1–27.
3. Murphy, M. Lynne. *Semantic Relations and the Lexicon: Antonymy, Synonymy, and Other Paradigms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. pp. 3–25; 133–169; 169–215.
4. Jones, S., Murphy, M. Lynne, Paradis, C., Willners, C. *Antonyms in English: Construals, Constructions and Canonicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. pp. 1–9.
5. *O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati*. 5 jildli. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston nashriyoti, 2021. 80 000 dan ortiq so‘z va so‘z birikmasi.
6. Izoh.uz — *O‘zbek tilining xalqona izohli lug‘ati*.
7. Sinonim.uz — *O‘zbek tili sinonimlar lug‘ati*.
8. Antonim.uz — *O‘zbek tili antonimlar lug‘ati*.
9. Cambridge Dictionary Grammar. “Adjectives”; “Gradable opposites
10. Cambridge English Thesaurus. Entries for *good, nice, lovely, wonderful, bad, pleasant, beautiful, and kind*.

