

**Melieva Nargizakhon Bakhodirovna**  
**Teacher, Tashkent Renaissance University**

---

## **COMPOUND ADJECTIVES IN ENGLISH**

**Abstract:** Compounds, defined as words formed by combining two or more words, are ubiquitous in English. Among various word-formation processes in morphology, compounding stands out as highly productive. This paper explores key concepts related to noun and adjective compounds. After a brief theoretical introduction on the structure and types of compounds, the study presents a corpus-based classification of 32 noun and adjective compounds. Examples were collected from women's magazines (Cosmopolitan) and analyzed to illustrate the structure and stress patterns of compounds. While compounds often have transparent compositional meanings, some may exhibit metaphorical or figurative meanings, potentially leading to confusion among speakers. Compounding remains a highly productive aspect of language, enabling the creation of numerous new words with both literal and non-literal meanings. Their translations might prove to be problematic for various reasons such as lack of translation equivalents, culture-specific lexemes, or differences in structural characteristics of the two languages. The paper thus provides the morphological and semantic analyses of the source vocabulary, lists the offered translations, and categorizes the adequacy of translation in the target language. Some pedagogical implications are offered in the conclusion.

**Key words:** Translation, adjectival compounds, morphological analysis, semantic analysis, word formation.

---

Modern linguistics recognizes the dialectical nature of language, which necessitates a comprehensive examination of all its conflicting elements. This study focuses on adjectives with a supporting substantive component (e.g., pocket-size, first-rate) in contemporary English as part of a holistic approach to word formation. The selection of adjectives with a basic substantive component that is not modified by derivational morphemes is justified by their representation of transitional cases that demonstrate dialectical connections between noun and adjective categories in English. Despite extensive research on the categorical status of attributive substantive units, a clear theoretical consensus remains elusive, impacting lexicographic practices. For instance, The Oxford English Dictionary categorizes "common law" as a phrase and notes its attributive usage ("common-law"), while the Longman Dictionary presents it as two homonymous units: the noun "common-law" and the adjective "common-law."

Distinguishing between adjectival and substantive units of this type is challenging in English due to the proximity of noun and adjective classes and the ongoing process of transition between these categories in language, as noted by A.M. Peshkovsky.

Theoretical attempts to determine the categorical affiliation of adjectives with a supporting substantive component have utilized a combination of phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and semantic criteria. However, inconsistent interpretation of semantic criteria has hindered consensus on their categorical status. The situation is further complicated by numerous transitional cases that allow for dual interpretation. This study assumes that vocabulary labels generally reflect the categorical affiliation of lexical units at a given language stage. Therefore, the research material comprises composites of the specified structure that authoritative British and American dictionaries classify as adjectives.

While recognizing these units as adjectives does not resolve the issue, it highlights the importance of their derivational nature. Traditional approaches to understanding first-rate type adjectives as transpositions (adjectivations) and one-horse type units as compositions reflect different perspectives on the same issue, a common feature of contemporary word formation theory. The study of non-affixal transposition through compound words can also shed light on its mechanism, which, despite its syntactic nature, is also a word-formation process.

Despite numerous observations on these adjective composites in lexicological, grammatical, and word-formation studies, a comprehensive analysis is lacking. This is because these adjectives have not been isolated as an independent object of study, and non-standard vocabulary (slang, colloquialisms) has been largely neglected. The controversy surrounding these adjectives underscores the need for a detailed description, particularly given that their derivational nature is a fundamental aspect of adjective theory and the study of noun and adjective categories as interdependent subsystems within a language system is crucial.

This study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of these adjectives as secondary nomination units, including their generation rules and derivational, semantic, and grammatical characteristics in paradigmatics and syntagmatics. Specific objectives include:

1. Clarifying the derivational process underlying their formation
2. Exploring their functional and semantic characteristics.

The material for this study was obtained through continuous sampling from 9 explanatory and bilingual dictionaries and partial sampling from The Oxford English Dictionary. Selection criteria included.

The study utilizes various dictionaries to compile a list of adjectives with fixed meanings and clarify their current usage. The vocabulary material comprises 707 complex adjectival units, and the textual material consists of approximately 10,000 pages from contemporary English and American literature. From the texts, all complex lexemes of the specified structure functioning as prepositional definitions or predicatives were selected. Dictionary verification distinguished between common adjectives and nouns and occasional units (e.g., last-minute messages, a Lockheed-type loan).

The primary focus of the study is on adjectives, but additional material is also analyzed when necessary. The study employs component analysis, transformational analysis, definitional analysis, and word-formation act reconstruction. To identify systemic patterns, the research material is examined in various aspects along dichotomies such as synchrony-diachrony, paradigmatics-syntagmatics, and statics-dynamics.

The following are key findings of the study:

1. The heterogeneity of the derivational processes underlying the formation of these adjectives is revealed through an onomasiological approach that analyzes them based on nominative features driving their motivation.
2. A multidimensional analysis of the semantics of the studied adjectives is provided, including a description of semantic components and relationships, patterns of derivative semantic formation, and a comparison of the semantics of the analyzed adjectives and their motivating units to distinguish between lexical and syntactic derivatives.

3. The functional characteristics of these adjectives in paradigmatics and syntagmatics are investigated, such as their ability to form synonymous and antonymous relationships, serve as a base for derivation, and exhibit specific lexical and syntactic compatibility.

The following propositions are submitted for defense:

1. The difference in derivational status between adjectival composites (derivatives from a complex, stem - complex derivatives) stems from their motivation by multi-level units (complex nouns or substantive phrases), demonstrating the interconnectedness of units at different linguistic levels.

2. The functional-semantic features of these derivatives without affixal morphological-syntactic transposition are primarily determined by the categorical and subcategorical relatedness of the supporting substantive components and the lexical-syntactic compatibility of directly motivating units (compound nouns or phrases).

3. The specific paradigmatic and syntagmatic functions of these composites indicate that they lack a complete set of adjective characteristics and occupy a peripheral zone within the adjectival name system.

4. In contemporary English, the nominative potential of non-affixal morphological-syntactic transposition as a word-formation process is realized in both standard and non-standard vocabulary, influenced by the communicative specificities of different domains.

English morphology handbooks provide a comprehensive overview of word-formation processes, with particular focus on nominal compounding as the most prevalent type. However, adjectival compounds receive less attention. Apart from brief classifications by scholars like Jespersen, Bauer, Quirk et al, and Plag, the only detailed accounts of these formations are offered by Marchand (1969) and Adams (1973). Marchand and Adams present distinct approaches and classifications for adjectival compounds, resulting in non-overlapping taxonomies. Marchand's classification includes nine types of compound adjectives, each corresponding to a specific stress pattern. Participial compounds are treated as a separate subgroup within adjectives and further subdivided based on the lexical class of the modifier (nominal or adjectival). This classification is considered the most thorough. Adams's classification is also comprehensive, identifying ten major groups including nominal compounds with an attributive function (e.g., free-lance) and derivational compounds (e.g., narrow-minded). Her classification and subclassifications are less straightforward compared to Marchand's, employing a mixed criterion that combines morphological (e.g., 'appositional' group), syntactic (e.g., 'prepositional', 'adjunct-verb' groups), functional, and semantic (e.g., 'instrumental', 'comparative' groups) aspects, not always consistently.

Unlike Marchand, Adams dismisses stress as a criterion for identifying subgroups but acknowledges the difficulty in distinguishing between compounds and phrases for certain formations. She suggests a test of identification and a frequency criterion, foreshadowing studies on productivity. Both authors briefly mention morphological productivity in their analyses, recognizing its relevance in understanding these formations.

#### **References:**

1. Libben, Gary, Gagné, Christina L. and Dressler, Wolfgang U. (2020). The representation and processing of compounds words. In V. Pirrelli, I. Plag & W.U:Dressler (Eds.). Word Knowledge and Word Usage: A Cross-Disciplinary doi.org/10.1515/9783110440577-009 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110440577-009>

2. Lieber, Rochelle, Pavol Štekauer. (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
3. Эргашева Д. И. К методическому вопросу анализа учебников в преподавании иностранных языков // Педагогическое мастерство: мат-лы II Междунар. науч. конф. (г. Москва, декабрь 2012 г.). М.: Буки-Веди, 2012.
4. Kazakbayeva D. Typology of the constituents of the semantic field of the concept of “ear” in English and Uzbek. SOI: 1.1/TAS. DOI: 10.15863/TAS International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science. p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online). Year: 2021. Issue: 11. Volume: 103 Published: 30.11.2021
5. Kazakbayeva, D. (2021). THE WORDS WITH THE SEMANTICS OF «EAR» PRAGMATIC PROPERTIES IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE. InterConf, (72). вилучено із <https://ojs.ukrlgos.in.ua/index.php/interconf/article/view/14143>
6. D. Kazakbayeva, S. Qodirov. Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida "quloq" semantic maydoni konstituentlari tipologiyasi, Science and education 2 (4), 2021, p441-452
7. Shukurdinovna, Shamatova O., and Kazakbayeva D. I. Kizi. "Pedagogical Problems of Creating English Textbooks." JournalNX, vol. 7, no. 1, 2021, pp. 109-112.
8. Сущность речевой культуры при обучении иностранному языку. Дильфуза Илхамовна Эргашева. Молодой ученый, 316-317, 2010
9. Kazakbayeva, D., Shokirov, Sh., & Mamatkulov, A. (2021). Research on lexicalsemantic field of “ear” in different structural languages. Philosophical readings 13, 2283-2289.
10. Plag, Ingo. (2018) *Word-Formation in English*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, 2018. ISBN: 978-1-316-62329-9
11. Ratih, Elisa,, Rosalin Ismayoeng Gusdian. (2018) Word formation processes in English new words of Oxford English dictionary (OED) online Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics 5.2 (2018): 24-35. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v5i2.7617>
12. Spencer, Andrew, Arnold M. Zwicky. (2017) *The Handbook of Morphology*. Print ISBN:9780631226949