

**FEATURES OF THE EXPRESSION OF THE MAIN FORM (POSITIVE FORM),
ACTING AS A BASIC COMPONENT OF THE FIELD OF COMPARATIVE
ADJECTIVES IN GERMAN AND AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGES**

Bayramova Ilaha Aliashab

Lecturer

Azerbaijan University of Languages

134 Rashid Behbudov str., Baku, Azerbaijan

Key words: *adjective, adjective degrees, compound, positive form, comparative linguistics.*

The article discusses the features of the expression of the basic form (positive form), which acts as a basic component of the field of comparative adjectives in German and Azerbaijani languages. The characteristics of the degree of adjectives in two multi-system languages are analyzed. Examples from the materials of the Azerbaijani and German languages are clearly given. The change of adjectives by degrees is a phenomenon related to which group of semantic features they belong to (quality, relativity, belonging). This property mainly refers to adjectives denoting quality. Adjectives of positive degree do not express the relation of the subject to other subjects, but play a decisive role in defining other degrees as a basic component of the field of comparativism. It is on the basis of this basic form of the adjective, adopted as the norm, that other features of the attribute and quality expressed by the adjective are clarified. Therefore, in both German and Azerbaijani languages, this form of the adjective acts as the main constitution in the field of its comparativism. The presence of this form ensures the existence of other forms of degree.

In comparable Azerbaijani and German languages, the degrees of comparison of adjectives are created by synthetic and analytical methods, but they are not used when expressing the usual form. In this case, the attribute and quality are expressed through the adjective itself. More precisely, the attribute and quality inherent in the object and phenomenon are abstractly expressed in the meaning of the adjective. If the domain of adjective comparativity is a macro-field as a whole, then this field itself reflects the synthesis of two micro-fields. If the first of them is a micro-field denoting equality, then the second is a field associated with inequality. The positive degree, accepted as the initial degree of an adjective, serves as an expression of the first micro-field – the field of equality.

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ВИРАЖЕННЯ ОСНОВНОЇ ФОРМИ (ПОЗИТИВНА ФОРМА), ЩО ВИСТУПАЄ ЯК БАЗОВИЙ КОМПОНЕНТ ПОЛЯ ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИХ ПРИКМЕТНИКІВ У НІМЕЦЬКІЙ ТА АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСЬКІЙ МОВАХ

Байрамова Ілаха Аліасхаб

викладач

Азербайджанський університет мов

вул. Рашида Бейбутова, 134, Баку, Азербайджан

Ключові слова: *прикметник, ступені прикметника, складне слово, позитивна форма, порівняльне мовознавство.*

У статті розглядаються особливості вираження основної форми (позитивна форма), яка виступає базовим компонентом поля порівняльних прикметників у німецькій та азербайджанській мовах. Аналізуються характеристики ступеня прикметників у двох різносистемних мовах. Наочно наведено приклади з матеріалів азербайджанської та німецької мов. Зміна прикметників за ступенями – це явище, пов'язане з тим, до якої групи семантичних ознак вони відносяться (якісні, відносні, присвійні). Ця властивість в основному відноситься до прикметників, що позначають якість. Прикметники звичайного ступеня не виражають відношення предмета до інших предметів, але відіграють вирішальну роль у визначенні інших ступенів як основного компонента області компаративізму. Саме на основі цієї основної форми прикметника, прийнятої як норма, пояснюються інші особливості ознаки та якості, що виражається прикметником. Таким чином, як у німецькій, так і в азербайджанській мовах ця форма прикметника виступає як основна конститутивна в області компаративізму. Наявність цієї форми забезпечує існування інших форм ступеня.

В азербайджанській та німецькій мовах ступені порівняння прикметників створюються синтетичними та аналітичними методами, але вони не використовуються у вираженні звичайної форми.

У даному випадку ознака і якість виражаються через саме прикметник. Точніше, атрибут і якість, властиві предмету та явищу, абстрактно виражаються в значенні прикметника. Якщо область порівняльності прикметників є макрополем в цілому, то саме це поле відображає синтез двох мікрополів. Якщо перше з них – мікрополе, що позначає рівність, то друге – поле, пов'язане з нерівністю. Позитивний ступінь, прийнятий як початковий ступінь прикметника, є виразом першого мікрополя – поля рівності.

Introduction. In the field of comparativity, the new quality of the defined replaces its original characteristic inherent in the subject. Speaking about the initial attribute, first of all, the state of the attribute and quality in the basic form of the adjective (in the positive) is meant. Undoubtedly, the area of comparativity in language manifests itself at different levels. In this sense, one should also agree with the opinion that the general comparativity is fundamentally different from the comparativity expressed by the forms of degrees of comparison of adjectives.

The specificity of the degrees of comparison of an adjective lies, first of all, in the relation, the ratio of objects of the same attribute and quality to each other.

But in addition to this idea, it can also be said that the superiority of one of the objects over another in

terms of attribute or quality is determined not only by their relationship to each other. It also arises on the basis of the relationship between the qualities or attributes of the objects being compared. The role of positive form, which we consider as a basic component of the sphere of comparativity, in determining these relations is no less important.

The purpose of the article is to show a similar and different features of attribute and quality of adjectives in Azerbaijani and German languages.

The object of the article is the expressive properties of the basic form (positive), which acts as the basic component of the adjective in German and Azerbaijani languages.

The subject of the article is to reveal the characteristics of the degrees of comparison, to identify

similarities and differences that serve to express the domain of comparative adjectives in both compared languages.

The main problem. V. Jung believes that the basic form of the adjective is the main degree of the field of comparativism (Grundstufe) [6, p. 172]. This degree of the adjective indicates the equality of the attribute in the compared subjects. For this purpose, the German language uses words denoting the comparison “so __ wie”, “ebenso __ wie”, for example: *Die Produktion ist so groß wie im vorigen Jahr.* (The harvest is as high as last year). Here the speaker used the expression “so groß wie”, linking the adjective “groß” with words denoting the comparison “so – wie”. The proposal expresses the idea that the talking point and the feature of production in the previous year are equally high in quantity. The adjective “groß” reflects that the attribute has the same form, that is, it is unchanged. Unlike V. Jung, Duden also added the words “ebenso, genauso, geradeso” and so on to the words of comparison, which in his grammar are used with the usual adjective form. The same degree of two features inherent in homogeneous objects is expressed by these words of comparison, in which it is noted. For example: *Er ist ebenso dumm wie Karl.* (He's (the only one) stupid like Carl).

The equality of degree between the attributes of objects can be denied. For example: *Er ist nicht so dumm, wie Karl. Meine Mutter kocht leider nicht so gut wie meine Oma.* At this time, the negation word *nicht* stands before the particle “so”.

The analysis of the linguistic material shows that in such sentences in the Azerbaijani language, the word negation is used after the adjective. For example: *O, Karl kimi səfeh deyil.*

The difference in such a comparison, both in Azerbaijani and in German, gives reason to say that both compared are stupid. But his stupidity has either a dynamic elevation or a weakness compared to Karl. But this does not mean at all that any of them in the “stupid and smart” conflict approaches the “smart” sign and creates a field of comparison with it. Therefore, referring to the mentioned sentence as “Carl is smart” does not reflect reality.

In Duden's grammar, it is noted that in German, in comparisons with formal signs, the particle “so” may also not be used. *Er ist (so) hart wie Stahl.* (It's as strong as steel). *So kalt wie Eis.* (Cold as ice). *Schlau wie ein Fuchs* (Sly as a fox).

A modified form of this structure is found in poetic expression. For example: “*wie Schnee so weiß*”. However, to indicate a comparison, it should be used with positive comparative conjunctions in German. For example.: *Unsere Produktion ist so groß wie die des zugehörigen Werkes.*

To express the comparison in the structural expressions “doppelt, dreifach, dreimal + so + adject-

ive”, the use of both comparison words (Conjunction – Konjunktionen) “wie” and “als” can be considered correct: *doppelt groß wie/als*. It is noticeable here that one of the homogeneous features is twice as high as the other. More precisely, the quantitative unevenness of the feature becomes known. For example: *Meine Wohnung ist doppelt so groß wie / als deine.* (My apartment is twice as big as yours). Of course, there is a difference between quantitative indicators of the quality inherent in the product. The analysis shows that, although in some cases the adjective is used in both languages to indicate a quantitative change in the attribute of an object and an event, it indicates equality, and not whether the attribute is quantitatively low or high. That is, the adjective is used in the positive gender. With the phrase “equality” in comparison, the quantitative indicator of quality is defined through “so”, “as it is”. However, when comparing features, two possible states of inequality are expressed in the words “more than ten” or “less than ten”. It also shows that one of the two attributes and qualities included in the comparison area may be higher or lower than the other for a certain period of time. Of course, the point of convergence of quantitative quality indicators in the plane of comparison (reduction of many, multiplication of a few) in this comparison indicates the neutralization of the difference. That is, if the point of equality of the attribute is designated “a”, and the attribute we are comparing is “b”, then as a result of comparing the attribute and quality, we get the neutralization formula “a=b”.

Having special merits in the field of German studies, O. Jespersen opposes the idea of including the usual degree (positive) in the number of degrees of comparison, speaking about the degrees of comparison of the adjective, which form the basis of the field of adjective comparativism. He notes that in most grammar textbooks, as a rule, it is indicated that the adjective has three degrees: positive, comparative and superlative. But with a closer look at this system from a logical point of view, first of all, it is not necessary to think too much about the fact that the “positive degree” cannot be called a “degree of comparison”, because if we call a horse “old” and a book “old”, then we are not comparing them with another horse or a book.

Thus, O. Jespersen once again emphasizes that the constituents of the sphere of comparativism should be homogeneous. Consequently, homogeneous objects and events become either equal or unequal to each other on homogeneous grounds. This similarity or difference creates a relative scope of the degree of a certain attribute.

One of the grammatical categories that characterize the adjective in German is the category of degrees of comparison. It also manifests itself in three degrees: positive degree, comparative degree, super-

lative degree. In the positive degree, an adjective necessarily means a attribute, without comparing it with the attribute of other objects.

In both comparable languages, regardless of which group (graded and non-graded) the adjective belongs to, each of them is treated in a positive way, showing the attributive and quality of the subject and event in their usual form. From the point of view of the semantic theory of relativity, adjectives denoting a feature related to the material denote quality, and adjectives referring to the original (qualitative). According to the rule, adjectives from this genus are not graded. For example: *hölzerne Bank* (wooden bench), *goldene Uhr* (golden watch). The semantics of the main morphemes in the adjectives “*hölzern* and *golden*” in these expressions does not indicate the relationship between the two items. Here there is not an external, but an internal relationship between an adjective and an item. More precisely, “*Holz* and *Gold*” in these combinations are not at all considered as different items, just as “*Bank*” and “*Uhr*”. *Holz* and *Gold* report on the seat and watch manufacturing material and are closely related to what they stand for. Based on the analysis of adjectives used in German, we can say that the adjectives mentioned below belong to a group of adjectives that do not have a degree at all: *blind*, *blöd*, *dicht*, *echt*, *fest*, *fett*, *feucht*, *glatt*, *heiß*, *laut*, *leicht*, *leise*, *mild*, *müde*, *nett*, *rasch*, *sanft*, *satt*, *schlecht*, *spitz*, *stolz*, *tot*, *weise*, *wild*, *zart*. However, when used figuratively, the rule is violated. For example: *Du bist mir der toteste Gesell* (Schiller). *Ich bin toter als alle ihre Toten* (Seghers).

In both the first and second sentences, the adjective “*tot*” was evaluated because it had a figurative meaning. (“*toteste*” is in the superlative degree, and “*toter*” is in the comparative degree).

Among the degrees of comparison of the adjective, the main degree is the positive form (Grundstufe) [5, p. 272]. The positive form, which is considered the main one when comparing two homogeneous features, serves to express equality between features and qualities. R. Conrad also summarizes his opinion about the positive form of the adjective so that this basic form of the adjective (Grundform) underlies the composition of the adjective. When using the word comparison “*wie*” items are compared with each other on equal levels compared to positive ones. For example: *Dieses Buch ist ebenso neu wie das erste*. (This book is as new as the first one). The quality being compared quantitatively either decreases or increases, intersecting at such a point that this point is considered the point of equality of attributes and qualities. For example: *Meine Mutter ist so alt wie deine*. When this sentence is also expressed as “*Deine Mutter ist so alt wie meine*”, although the sentence structure changes, the attribute of what is being compared remains unchanged. In this case, the adjective expressing the attribute and quality is

used in a positive form between the components of the connector “*so...wie*”. In German, an adjective is used in negation when the inequality of a attribute is expressed. For example: *Bonn ist nicht so groß wie Berlin*. (Bonn is not as big as Berlin). Here *groß* indicates that the attribute is quantitatively different, but it was used in a positive form. Commenting on the degree features of the adjective in German linguistics, Y. Schendels notes that there are such adjectives that remain unchanged in degree, that is, they are used in a positive capacity as the main form of the adjective. This includes adjectives related to various attributes and qualities. For example: *gestrig*, *heutig*, *jährlich*, *täglich*, *stählern*, *seiden*, *wollen*, *englisch*, *russisch*, *deutsch*, *aserbajdschanisch*, *taub*, *stumm*, *blind*, *tot*, *ganz*, *lila*, *rosa*, *orange*, etc.

As Helbig notes, in a figurative sense, qualitative adjectives denoting the material of an object can also be used in a sentence as a predicate. For example: *Sein Wille ist eisern*. (Wie aus Eisen.) [5, p. 281].

Thus, when used as an attribute, variables can be attributed, but not gradable adjectives:

- adjectives denoting affiliation: *die staatliche Arztpraxis* (*ärztlich*, *schulisch*, *betrieblich*, etc.)
- adjectives denoting a sign of origin: *der bulgarische Wein*, *die südamerikanischen Indianer*, etc.
- adjectives denoting a sign of time and space: *gestrig*, *heutig*, *hier*, *dort*, etc.
- number of rows: *der zehnte Jahrestag*, *das hundertste Experiment*, etc. [5, p. 281].

From the examples it is clear that such adjectives are used mainly in the positive. Only those attributes can be graded if they are used figuratively. Sometimes, in positive speech, the positive form of the adjective is used for the purpose of expressive strengthening of meaning. For example: *mein liebes, liebes Mädchen; der viele, viele Schnee; die lange, lange Straße lang*. In this function, the adjective (the same) is repeated (*liebes, liebes*). In the combination “*mehr als + adjective*”, the positive form of the adjective approaches the compound in meaning. For example: *Ich bin mehr als satt*. In a positive form, a comparison is expressed in the eigenvalues of derived adjectives with the suffixes *-haft*, *-isch*, *-ig*. For example: “*eine bärenhafte Gestalt*”, “*mein bärischer, bulliger Onkel*”.

While the semantic property inherent in an adjective is expressed in the positive in its main degree in the field of comparativism, quantitative changes in quality and attribute associated with other degrees of comparison are formed on the basis of the basic component. For example:

1. *Bütün bu uzaq xatirələr bir ilıqlıq gətirdi; bir sevinc gətirdi; Mahmud o ağ çiçəyin ətrini duydu, o isti təndir çörəyinin iyini və dadını hiss etdi, o cıqılı cücənin həyatdakı ilk civiltisini eşitdi və bu vaxt ...*

2. *Ziyad xan ən gizli işləri, ən böyük etibar tələb edən tədbirləri Bayandur bəyin əli ilə görürdü.*

In the first of these two sentences, adjectives denoting quantitative indicators of quality related to the subject and event (*uzaq, ağ, isti, cıqqılı, ilk*) are used in a positive way. And in the second sentence, the adjectives “*ən gizli*”, “*ən böyük*”, unlike the first, are given in the degree of multiplication. To do this, in accordance with the grammatical system of the language, the basic component of adjectives (*gizli, böyük*) and the particle “*ən*” were used.

Analyzing the category of adjective degree in the Azerbaijani language, O.Musayev believes that in the Azerbaijani language, as in a number of languages (e.g. English), the adjective usually does not have a special means of expression. However, when comparing items of the same quality, the analytical morpheme as is used. This morpheme is used before an adjective of the usual degree. For example: *Bu roman o roman kimi maraqlı deyil. Bu küçə bizim küçə kimi geniş və işıqlıdır*, etc.

But M.Huseynzade in his 2007 edition “Modern Azerbaijani language. Morphology” notes that the positive degree differs from other degrees both in content and in form in that it is considered a criterion for all degrees. Adjectives in their normal state express normal quality, attribute, color, and so on. Other degrees have different names depending on this usual situation; that is, they differ from the usual degree in both form and content. Consequently, the usual degree of adjective definition is also common: *böyük dağ, böyük şəhər, böyük qardaş* [1, p. 79]. Therefore, M.Huseynzade shows that the positive degree differs from other degrees both in content and form in that it is considered a criterion for all degrees.

However, what is unclear in this explanation is that the author does not disclose the mechanism for determining the quality indicator and attribute, its boundaries in the field of comparativism, more precisely, it is unclear at what point of quality, according to M.Huseynzade, the adjective “*böyük*” begins and ends when he says “*böyük şəhər*”.

A similar interpretation is found in the works of H. Mirzazade. He also believes that the positive degree of an adjective means the usual – the normal state of quality and attribute inherent in a thing. There is no formal designation of an positive degree in the Azerbaijani language. ... The positive degree of an adjective is usually considered the unit of measurement of other degrees [3, p. 150]. Even in this explanation, the question of how to define the positive degree itself remains unclear. It also shows that all adjectives included in the lexical composition of the language have the usual degree. This is what other forms of obtaining a degree are based on. The analysis shows that linguists unequivocally indicate that the positive degree (positive) is a universal property of the adjective for all languages. Other degrees are determined in relation to the basic component of the

attribute and quality, depending on the quantitative decrease or increase. It is for this reason that there is no consensus among modern linguists about the usual degree of an adjective. Some in the classification of adjective degrees indicate the usual degree in the first place, others explain it not as an adjective degree, but as a starting point. That is why the usual degree does not apply to the degrees of comparison of the adjective. A.G. Eyvazov also noted that grammatically the usual form of adjectives expresses only the full manifestation of the attribute and quality, without showing any relation of comparison. Therefore, it is advisable to indicate the usual form of the adjective first in the classification of degrees of adjectives. Another source indicates that there are no special figurative signs in the Azerbaijani language for the formation of the usual degree of an adjective. This degree is considered the beginning, the first type of other degrees [4, p. 66]. Therefore, adjectives that do not have a degree attribute are adjectives of the positive degree. For example: *yağlı, yaşıl, hündür, dəli, boz*, etc.

A similar explanation can be found in G. Kazimov’s book “Modern Azerbaijani language. Morphology”. He writes that the usual degree of an adjective is an indefinite degree, without a measure of degree. That is, a attribute of adjectives of the usual degree is a degree whose quality more or less does not reflect what is at a normal level, visible to the naked eye, perceived by the senses. The attribute and quality expressed by this degree are relative and conditional. For example, we consider the adjectives black, sweet, red as adjectives of the usual degree. In fact, there is no exact and absolute measure of the attribute, the quality expressed by the words black, red, sweet.

Thus, two white papers, two red fabrics, two sweet fruits must necessarily be more or less different from each other, and they are also different. However, since the difference in attribute and quality that we mention is imperceptible, we cannot distinguish them with a positive glance, we call both papers white paper, both parts red cloth in general, and both fruits sweet fruits [2, p. 119].

It also shows that the positive degree has no absolute limit. This degree also has no graphical attribute. Therefore, all adjectives without a degree attribute are considered positive degrees. Sometimes this degree is also called the zero degree.

“Modern Azerbaijani Language Volume II. Morphology” shows that not all linguists treat the positive degree of an adjective equally. It is even indicated that this degree is not included in the degree of adjectives. If there is no difference between the same attribute encountered, then it is no longer possible to talk about degrees.

Conclusion. So when we talk about degrees, we are talking about the difference between these degrees. When this is the case, there is no positive

degree. However, there are words in the language that do not designate a minority or majority as a lexical unit. Rather, the relation of most adjectives in the vocabulary of the language to degrees is neutral. The change in the attribute and quality, to what extent it changes, occurs in comparison with these neutral words (adjectives) in the vocabulary of the language. Therefore, it is wrong to leave even an positive degree outside the degree system. Thus, the original adjectives that do not take any degree features are considered positive degrees.

The comparison shows that regardless of which language family or group the language belongs to, the positive degree, which forms the basic part of the domain of adjective comparativism, has a universal character and is characteristic of each language.

Further perspective of the work. The article analyzes the degrees of adjectives used in German and Azerbaijani languages on a scientific and theoretical basis in these sentences and examines their specific functional features. Speaking about the similarity and distinctive features of the degrees of comparison of adjectives in both languages, the principles, expressions of these adjectives in sentences in Azerbaijani

compared to German, as well as the identification of distinctive and similar features between them constitute a further perspective of the work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Hüseynzadə M. (2007) Müasir Azərbaycan dili, III hissə. Morfologiya. Bakı, “Şərq-Qərb”, 280 s.
2. Kazımov Q.Ş. (2010) Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Morfologiya. Bakı, Elm və Təhsil, 399 s.
3. Mirzəzadə H. (1962) Azərbaycan dilinin tarixi morfologiyası. Bakı, Azərtədrisnəşr.
4. Müasir Azərbaycan dilinin morfologiası, APUNun nəşriyyatı Bakı, 1961, 190 s.
5. Helbig/Buscha Deutsche Grammatik. Berlin, Langenscheidt, 731 s.
6. Jung W. (1973) Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. VEB Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, 518 s.
7. Hofmann L. (2021) Deutsche Grammatik. Grundlagen für Lehrerbildung, Schule, Deutsch als Zweitsprache und Deutsch als Fremdsprache Berlin, 722 s.
8. Səfiyev R. (2018) Alman dilinin qrammatikası. Bakı.