

DEVIAN'T FORMS OF ADJECTIVES IN MODERN UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE: TEACHING FEATURES IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE UKRAINIAN COURSE AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Daria Riazantseva, Olena Bilyk, Larysa Kokhan, Liudmyla Kokhan, Halyna Sokolova

ABSTRACT

Perfect language skills are an integral part of the professional training of modern specialists in various specialties, since the full manifestation of an individual's professional talents occurs through language tools. Skillfully mastering language tools, a future specialist can realize him/herself both professionally and in various life roles, solve problem situations in interpersonal communication, and ensure effective interaction in a team.

Language is a means of self-expression and self-affirmation and teaching foreign students to master various linguistic means by introducing modern technologies in language learning and understanding numerous grammatical structures and features of the Ukrainian language.

The authors consider the features of studying atypical forms of adjectives in the structure of the Ukrainian language course as a foreign language in view of the modern communicative conditionality of language and the emotional and evaluative marking of language units of different levels, primarily adjectives of the Ukrainian language. Deviant forms of adjectives are presented through consideration of semantic and grammatical features of adjectives of the Ukrainian language, analyzed from the point of view of pragmatics. The chapter provides examples of problematic situations in the study of atypical forms of the Ukrainian adjective by foreign students and comments on the peculiarities of studying the Ukrainian adjective in the structure of the course of Ukrainian as a foreign language.

KEYWORDS

Adjective of the Ukrainian language, foreign students, pragmatics, evaluative marking, Ukrainian as a foreign language.

9.1 COMMUNICATIVE CONDITIONALITY OF LANGUAGE IN THE CONTEXT OF LANGUAGE TRAINING OF FOREIGN STUDENTS

The problem of teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language is extremely relevant in the modern realities of increasing the prestige of Ukraine as an independent state that fights for its sovereignty, acts as a participant in key world unions and associations.

In order to master the language in full, foreign students studying in Ukrainian universities also study Ukrainian culture, history, peculiarities of mentality and realities, associated with the country of the language being studied. The language teaching system should be structurally and communicatively oriented,

the study of language units and categories should take place from the position of forming the skills to correctly express their thoughts in the Ukrainian language.

Thus, the communicative conditionality of language is its integral distinction. Modern methodologists [1-3] agree that language development should be carried out in a situationally conditioned context. Working with students in an educational communicative situation can ensure the activation of language knowledge and speech skills, as well as the development of communicative abilities.

The language situation in modern linguistics is understood as a combined complex that includes both external and internal factors (rational and emotional characteristics of speakers, their intentions, assessments) [1]. Emotional and evaluative marking can be expressed by units of all language levels, but it is adjectives as carriers of evaluative meanings that attract the most attention.

Since ancient times, living human language has been permeated, imbued with feelings, impressions, emotions, assessments – “the world that is known is always evaluated, assessment is evidence of the degree of cognization of the world” [4]. Evaluation has gone from a concept to a category, which was carried out first in the bosom of philosophy, and later in logic, psychology, ethnology and, finally, linguistics, thus acquiring a certain scientific status. Evaluation is a linguistic category, since language reflects the interaction of reality and human in various aspects, one of which is precisely the evaluative one.

There are a large number of philosophical problems related to the differentiation of evaluation and cognition itself, and in linguistics, questions arise about the means of implementing the category of evaluation, about the distinction between evaluative and non-evaluative statements, about the pragmatic linguistic significance of evaluative means, the specifics of their creation, formation, development, about the comparison of evaluative means of different languages, etc.

Carrying out a functional-communicative analysis of the category of evaluation, T. Kosmeda explores the nature of evaluation, expressed by different parts of speech, including the adjective, emphasizing that “not only lexical, but also grammatical semantics, and the partial linguistic stratification of vocabulary with the semantics of evaluation are oriented towards the performance of evaluative functions”, considers the evaluative properties of some adjective lexemes and their oppositional pairs: *свій – чужий, стільний, лівий – правий, святий, ангельський, райський, божественний, пекельний, лексему благословенний, вольний*, etc. [5].

The formation of comparative and superlative forms of qualitative adjectives and the connection of such forms with the expression of an evaluative attitude towards the environment is studied by O. Khaliman [6]. According to the researcher, the formation of comparative and superlative forms of qualitative adjectives is associated with the expression of an evaluative attitude towards the environment, which is due to the nature of degree forms: the quantitative element of measure is superimposed on the qualitative basis, which forms an emotional-evaluative one.

The monograph “Ukrainian Occasional Derivation” by Zh. Koloiz [7] demonstrates that individual morphological words have much broader possibilities for implementing the morphological categories, usually assigned to them, and gives examples of the occasional use of relative, possessive and ordinal adjectives, which, contrary to morphological norms, are combined into gradational series (cf.: *весняний – весняніший; наш – нашіший, перший – первіший*) and are potentially capable of closing them (cf.: *найвесняніший, найнашіший*), and express the oppositional intensity of features (*крутосхилий, крутосхилиший*).

Occasional grammatical modifications, which represent the category of relative intensity of a feature, in the researcher's opinion, appear as peculiar deviations from the norm, while a peculiar pragmatics of occasional phenomena appears.

T. Kots in the monograph "Literary norm in the functional-stylistic and structural paradigm" gives a clear definition of the grammatical norm and writes about the rethinking and shifts in the semantics of words at the current stage of its development, which determine the processes of expanding the semantic scope of lexemes and the formation of new shades of meaning in modern language. The researcher presents a significant number of variant lexical and phonemic units, including adjectives (for example, *есенгівський – есендівський – есендевський; самотній – самітній*), distinguishes between positive and negative evaluative values, analyzes the reasons for the emergence of such linguistic units, including the influence of foreign languages [8].

Numerous occasional adjectives, their structural and semantic features and role in the formation of poetic discourse are highlighted by O. Zhyzhoma [9]. The author emphasizes that although in poetic speech there is an occasional use of authorial formation: the construction of forms of degrees of comparison from both qualitative and relatively qualitative and relative adjectives, such formations are in no way connected with the insufficient communicative competence of native speakers, but are based on the use of the potential of grammatical forms. This is a consequence of an individual search, which is based on the interaction of cognitive, communicative and pragmatic components of the statement, determined by the peculiarities of the axiological system of each artist.

The authors of the monograph "Dynamic processes in the Ukrainian lexicon" N. Klymenko, E. Karpilovska, L. Kyslyuk study active examples of word formation of neosemanticisms and occasionalisms in various parts of speech, including adjectives, analyze numerous extralingual and intralingual reasons for their occurrence, including the expansion of semantics, language play, and manipulation of meanings. Numerous examples, given in the work, testify to "the active creation in of comparatives and superlatives from almost any adjective, participle, or adverb the Ukrainian expressive-evaluative context" [10].

Several cases of using the creative potential of the grammatical category of degrees of comparison of adjectives are presented in the work "Fundamentals of Communicative Deviationology" by the modern researcher F. Batsevich [11], classifying them as "grammatical deviations", namely "anomalous forms of adjectives and adverbs".

The evaluation, which implements a certain illocutionary effect on the interlocutor, is an obligatory element in some speech acts, therefore the evaluative value of adjectives and its potential manipulative effect on the audience attracts the attention of advertisers and specialists in the field of PR and Internet technologies, which is reflected in linguistic works on advertising. Violations of language norms in the field of adjectives and the evaluativeness that appears in this are described in the works of many linguists.

A characteristic feature of an adjective is the ability to convey the meaning of different degrees of magnitude of a feature using suffixes of subjective evaluation. In the grammars of the Ukrainian language (works by M. Zhovtobryukh, Z. Sikorska, V. Shynkaruk, M. Plyushch), such adjectival formations have been given considerable attention, suffixes of subjective evaluation have been systematized, a number of suffixal word-formation types have been analyzed, expressing various shades of diminutiveness, littleness,

pettiness and augmentation, coarseness, and other negative and positive features. O. Potebnya also drew attention to the possibility of using diminutive-pettish suffixes as a means of expressing evaluation in the Ukrainian language. According to T. Kosmeda, emotional-evaluative affixes have broad semantic possibilities and are means of creating evaluative meaning at the word-formation level [5]. The development of this issue in Ukrainian studies is being carried out by I. Kovalyk, A. Nelyuba, O. Oleksenko, T. Chortoryzka, L. Shutak, and others.

9.2 LEXICAL-GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF ADJECTIVES OF THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE AS THE BASIS FOR THE GENERATION OF THE GRAMMATICAL MEANING OF EVALUATION

Any category of evaluative words originates from the adjective. Evaluativeness is the primary semi-logical function of the adjective as a part of speech, its specific linguistic part, which distinguishes the adjective from other parts of speech. The general categorical meaning of adjectives as a class of words is characteristic. It is the sphere of adjectival word use that most clearly demonstrates the abstraction and analyticity of human mental activity, due to which the characteristic is thought of separately from the referent. The wide semantic scope of adjectives is natural also because in the objective, social and spiritual spheres there are much more properties, qualities, pragmatic and emotional assessments than the objects, events, persons to whom they belong or are nominally attributed.

The basis of language use is the selection and generalization of the characteristics of events and objects. By designating a feature, an adjective plays an important role in the language system and the communication process. The lexical, word-formation and morphological features of the adjective are considered in the studies of A. Hryshchenko, N. Stepanenko, A. Shramm, G. Shipitsyna, V. Chernov, etc.

In linguistic literature, traditional views on the adjective as a grammatically and, to a large extent, semantically dependent part of the language, located on the periphery of word classes, are widespread (I. Vykhovalnets, K. Bilodid). At the same time, there is a widespread opinion that adjectives, together with nouns and verbs (often considered to be also with adverbs), are the main parts of the language, since they cover with their semantics the two most common categories of thought — substance and feature [12].

The contradictory views of linguists on the adjective are caused by its multifaceted lexical-syntactic nature: on the one hand, the adjective exhibits the features of a nominatively meaningful part of speech, on the other, it has lexical meanings that can be realized only when combined with other parts of speech, primarily with nouns.

We agree with the opinion of K. Gorodenska, who defines the adjective as one of the peripheral parts of speech, which denotes a feature of an object, has the inflectional morphological categories of gender, number and case, determined by the supporting noun, functions in a sentence as a formal-syntactic nominal secondary member of the sentence and as a semantic-syntactic attributive component (attributive syntax) and can perform the communicative function of a theme or a rheme or be part of a complex theme or a rheme [13].

Depending on the type of feature underlying the semantics of the word, adjectives are divided into four main groups: qualitative, relative, possessive and ordinal. Each of these groups has its own (more or

less pronounced) grammatical features. The lexical-grammatical category of qualitative constitutes the semantic center of adjectives, since it denotes features that usually exist in the original forms regardless of other objects and when compared can be manifested to different degrees or with different intensity. The consequences of such a comparison of features are transmitted by the grammemes of the comparative and superlative degrees of comparison. Qualitative adjectives can be combined with adverbs of degree and measure. A. Grishchenko refers qualitative adjectives to the category of semantic-morphological phenomena. The meanings of relative adjectives are largely determined by the meanings of the words, from which they are formed. A number of scientists consider their semantics to be more complex compared to qualitative adjectives [14, 15].

In grammatical studies, it is widely stated that the category of degrees of comparison is inherent in the Ukrainian language to qualitative adjectives and qualitatively-descriptive adverbs. Often, it is precisely on the basis of the presence/absence of the specified category that qualitative and relative adjectives are contrasted as lexical-morphological categories. If the forms of gender, number and case of adjectives serve only as means of grammatical coordination of the name of the feature with the name of the object, then the degrees of comparison and forms of non-relative gradation are means of characterizing the objective feature of the object, expressed by the noun.

As for the grammatical categories of the adjective, the morphological adjective categories of gender, number and case are "too abstract values, which actually serve as a means of expressing the syntactic subordination of the adjective to the noun and an indication of the denotative role of the adjective in the most abstract (undifferentiated) expression" [15]. The category of case is also grammatically dependent and manifests itself in forms, agreed with the base noun [16]. The category of membership/non-membership as a morphological means of expressing the categorical meaning of a feature is also a declensional, dependent on the noun, and not a classification category of an adjective. A feature of this category is the ability of only qualitative adjectives to construct short forms.

The issues of the semantic and morphemic structure of adjectives in the Ukrainian language have been widely covered in linguistic literature. However, existing monographic studies of adjectives are mostly devoted to the analysis of their lexical, word-formation, and morphological features, and atypical forms of the adjective, determined by its evaluative semantics and their study in the structure of the Ukrainian language as a foreign language course, belong to a little-studied aspect of research.

Among the numerous classifications of adjectives, their division into lexical-grammatical categories of qualitative and relative stands out. These two groups of adjectives differ from each other in a number of essential features, which is partially reflected in the nominations "qualitative" and "relative". Lexical-grammatical categories of adjectives refer to a grammatically relevant group of words within the adjective as a part of speech. Qualitative adjectives convey a qualitative evaluation of the referent, relative adjectives denote a feature through a relationship to another referent, event, feature, action.

The seme structure of qualitative adjectives includes the seme "evaluation" [17]. The universality of the lexical meanings of qualitative adjectives makes it possible to combine them with a wide range of nouns. Orientation to one or another sign of evaluation allows qualitative adjectives to enter synonymous or antonymic paradigms. A variety of evaluation is intensity. The presence of the seme "intensity" in

the seme structure contributes to another property of qualitative adjectives – the ability to have degrees of comparison and the ability to attach adverbial expanders to themselves.

So, the evaluative meaning itself is the main semantic marker of qualitative adjectives. At the same time, some adjectives, including evaluative ones, combine in their semantics features of both qualitative and relative ones. I. Kononenko in her dissertation research “Lexical-semantic potential of the adjective in Slavic languages” demonstrates how in the context of such adjectives, the semes that correspond to the communicative purpose are actualized: (Ukrainian) This is *grandma's blouse* (central seme – “appropriation”, peripheral – “evaluation”). This is some *grandma's blouse* (central seme – “evaluation”, peripheral – “appropriation”) [17]. According to the researcher, the speaker may perceive adjectives of this type as relative, and the addressee of speech, depending on his/her social worldview, may feel an evaluation in them, while the potential belonging of such adjectives to both lexical-grammatical categories is often accompanied by a blurring of the boundaries of the direct and figurative lexical-semantic variant, which leads to the actualization of the evaluative semantics of such adjectives and contributes to their shift towards the lexical-grammatical category of qualitative [17].

The process of developing qualitative meanings in relative adjectives occurs in language constantly. When forming degrees of comparison from, for example, adjectives denoting an absolute feature, processes arise that involve human mental resources, encyclopedic knowledge of the addresser and addressee, that is, non-linguistic factors. Therefore, the probability of forming a degree of comparison from an adjective to denote an absolute feature is a question of knowledge of the world, not of the linguistic system. The exact interpretation of an adjective reflects the grammatical functions of the meaning of the word, therefore, when we say that “relative adjectives do not have degrees of comparison, we mean their purely relative meanings”.

Therefore, the boundaries between qualitative and relative adjectives are not fixed, but mobile, relative adjectives as a result of rethinking or transposition can acquire the meaning of quality, which determines the emergence of atypical forms of adjectives that cause difficulties in understanding by foreign students.

Language is “alive”, and “to live” means to change, not remaining in the previous state, therefore, we consider the tendency to actively transition of relative adjectives into qualitative ones to be a specific linguistic feature at the current stage of its development.

9.3 GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF THE CATEGORY OF ADJECTIVES' COMPARISON DEGREES

The category of comparison degrees is considered one of the most complex grammatical categories of the Ukrainian language, with which syntactic, morphological and word-forming characteristics of the word are associated. Its study concerns current problems of theoretical morphology, syntax and derivation. In modern linguistics, the concept of “category of comparison degrees” is understood as a grammatical category of qualitative adjectives and adverbs, denoting a variable feature that, when compared, prevails in some object or reaches its greatest expression in it.

Linguists, such as D. Barannyk, V. Vinogradov, A. Hryshchenko, M. Zhovtobryukh, Yu. Karpenko, V. Kachura, N. Kostusyak, E. Kurylovich, L. Volkmar, O. Potebnya, L. Tenier, and others dealt with individual

issues of analysis and classification of comparison degrees. Solving the issue of the status of comparative and superlative components, linguists often resort to qualifying them as forms of the same word and classify them as adjective inflection (I. Bilodid). From the standpoint of modern achievements of linguistics, the grammemes of the comparative and superlative are interpreted in a different aspect, giving them a morphological and word-forming status. In this direction, the problem of the category of comparison degrees was developed in the works of I. Vykhovanets, G. Gelbig, O. Bezpyasno. Some issues of the formation of adjectives in the Ukrainian literary language were given attention by Z. Kaspyryshyn, M. Dolenko, A. Zverev, V. Gorpynych, K. Gorodenska, N. Klymenko. However, there are currently no works that reveal the pragmatic potential of the adjective as a part of speech and explain the emergence of atypical forms of the adjective.

Modern scientific research is distinguished by its view of comparison degrees as a category, with its own place in the problem of expressing quality degrees. Some linguists attribute this category to interlevel, since it has inherent features, associated with the morphological, syntactic and word-formation levels of the grammatical system [13]. I. Vykhovanets qualifies it as a word-formation-syntactic category, N. Kalashnikov — as a word-changer. N. Kostusyak calls the category of comparison degrees a morphological-syntactic-word-formation category of an adjective, because among other morphological-word-formation categories (categories of a non-relative measure of quality and categories of subjective evaluation), only it is associated with semantic-syntactic valence, since graded words act as the main semantic component of an elementary sentence and require filling open positions with appropriate contextual partners. V. Gorpynych considers the adjective category of the comparative and superlative comparison degrees to be classification, or lexical-grammatical or word-forming.

The grammatical category of comparison degrees is an integral feature of a number of adverbial forms. Their specificity lies in syntactic functions and syntactic positions that are different from graded adjectives. The study of this category is associated with little-studied issues of theoretical linguistics, and significant disagreements still arise in the interpretation of individual provisions. The issues of the status of graded forms, the principles of their classification, their grammeme composition, and pragmatic potential remain unresolved today. The category of comparison degrees in the Ukrainian language is one of the most complex grammatical categories, with which semantic, syntactic, morphological, word-forming, and pragmatic characteristics of the word are associated. Her research concerns current problems of theoretical morphology, syntax, word formation, and — let's add — pragmatics.

The types of approaches to studying the category of comparison degrees are differentiated depending on the consideration of its structure, which is determined by the number of opposed rows of forms with a homogeneous meaning. According to this feature, two (comparative, superlative) or three (positive, comparative, superlative) degrees of comparison are distinguished. Scientists justify the need for the existence of three elements in the structural scheme of comparison, which are interdependent and interconnected. These elements form certain pairs of oppositions consisting of two grammemes. One of them is the basis for comparison, the second indicates the increase in the intensity of the feature that is revealed as a result of comparison. The first opposition is formed by lexemes of the positive degree, which expresses a feature outside of relation to other objects, and of the comparative degree, which indicates a feature of the object that is inherent to it to a greater extent compared to the form of the positive degree. The second pair of oppositions is formed

with the grammemes of the comparative and superlative degrees. A characteristic flaw of such theories is the failure to take into account the fact that the first member of the opposition does not contain a comparative meaning, and therefore the allocation of the positive degree contradicts the very essence of the analyzed grammatical category. In addition, the comparative and superlative determine the degree of manifestation of a feature not in comparison with the positive degree, but in comparison with the degree of manifestation of this feature in some specific carriers of it. This means that the very idea of comparison is inherent only in the comparative or superlative and, accordingly, only these forms are degrees of comparison. Based on the above-mentioned features of the analyzed phenomenon, most linguists believe that it is more appropriate to qualify the category of the relative measure of quality as a two-membered one. Various aspects of such a theoretical position have been reflected in the works of many linguists and vary in the names "comparative and superlative degree" (I. Vykhovanets, Yu. Karpenko), "first and second degree" (I. Bilodid), "comparative and superlative" (A. Grishchenko, L. Tenier), and others. The above classifications have a fundamental common basis, which is manifested in the semantic and formal characteristics of this grammatical category. The meaning of the forms of the comparative degree is generally defined as a greater degree of manifestation of the compared feature, which is characteristic of two carriers or inherent in one carrier, but is considered at a different point in time or under different circumstances. The superlative degree denotes the greatest degree of the qualitative state of the object. The grammatical status of the category of the comparative/superlative degrees of comparison of adjectives is also determined differently. Some linguists (M. Zhovtobryukh, V. Plotnikova, etc.) attribute it to the inflectional, since, in their opinion, the zero, comparative and superlative forms do not differ from each other in lexical meaning, that is, adjectival forms of the type *добрий, добріший, найдобріший* have the same lexical, but different morphological meanings. These linguists consider the grammatical forms of qualitative adjectives to be degrees of comparison, which express the unequal degree of manifestation of the same feature in different compared objects. The forms of the comparative (as well as the superlative) degree of comparison, in their opinion, do not differ in their lexical meaning from the form of the original adjective, therefore they are not separate lexemes, but separate forms of a qualitative adjective (i.e., one lexeme), which belong to the inflectional paradigm. Other linguists (A. Grishchenko) believe that the zero, comparative and superlative degrees differ in lexical meaning, have different word-forming means of its expression and therefore constitute different lexemes. This approach is becoming dominant in modern linguistics.

In the works of I. Vykhovanets, O. Bezpozasko, comparative and superlative grammemes are considered as a category with a separate morphological and word-forming status. The semantic specificity of comparative and superlative grammemes is manifested in the fact that they form independent lexical units, in which the lexical meaning is modified and the motivation of the need to express the corresponding degree of manifestation of the feature occurs. Traditionally, the formation of comparison degrees is considered in morphology. According to V. Gorpnych, the category of the degree of manifestation of the feature has four grammemes: zero degree, higher degree, or comparative, highest degree, or superlative, absolute degree, or elative [17]. Traditional in Ukrainian linguistics is the definition of the comparative as the higher degree of comparison of adjectives/adverbs, which expresses a greater or lesser degree of manifestation of a feature compared to the neutral degree, the superlative as the highest degree of comparison of adjectives, which expresses the greatest degree of manifestation of a feature compared to the neutral degree. In addition to these

grammemes, there is also a form of the elative – the grammeme of the highest degree of comparison, which means an absolute, extreme, limiting measure of manifestation of a feature unrelated to comparison [13].

The category of comparison degrees of the Ukrainian language is inherent only to predicates with the meaning of quality [16]. It is known that the so-called comparative and superlative degrees of comparison are not formed from all adjectives. It is often indicated that the category of comparison degrees is inherent only to qualitative adjectives. In this regard, O. Bezpyasko notes: “The measure of intensity of a feature, its quantitative expression is conveyed only by qualitative adjectives; these values are not inherent in relative adjectives. However, among qualitative adjectives, the carriers of the semantic-grammatical meanings of intensity and quantity of a feature are not the entire composition of lexemes, but only the derived groups of names that characterize the object according to external and internal signs” [18]. The idea that relative adjectives express an invariable feature of an object as a property that follows from its connections with other objects or phenomena of extralinguistic reality has been established in linguistics and is not subject to any doubts.

Despite the restrictions, imposed by the language system, in the communicative space itself, in specific communication situations, there are cases when representatives of the category of relative intensity of the feature are morphological words with the part-speech meaning of attribution, which express the feature of objects indirectly, through the relationship to other objects, as well as those qualitative words that, according to morphological norms, are deprived of the gradation of a qualitative feature, as well as adjectives with the meaning of possessiveness or ordinality. In this regard, the grammemes of the comparative, superlative and elative require a comprehensive classification for an adequate interpretation of their grammatical peculiarity in the system of parts of speech, as well as for providing comments on the study of such atypical forms of adjectives by foreign students and the introduction of new mechanisms into the methodology of the Ukrainian language as a foreign one.

Reflections on the peculiarities of the gradation of features by adjectives of different lexical and grammatical categories are presented by Yu. Karpenko – “if you think about it, then in our world there is nothing but objects – real or imaginary (virtual) and signs, attributes of these objects. Signs can be fixed, static, expressed mainly by adjectives (the boy is smart, the boy is stupid), and dynamic, rapidly changing, transmitted mainly by verbs (the boy eats, the boy sleeps). But both are signs of objects. There is nothing else in the world. And gradation – the volume, the measure of manifestation of a sign – cannot be its most essential property. After all, all other grammatical categories of adjectives (gender, number and case) are simply a reflection of the corresponding features of the object – a noun. But the expression of degree – positive, comparative, superlative (or first, second, third and, not excluded, fourth) – is a grammatical category organically inherent in adjectives, long associated with qualitative adjectives. Nowadays it penetrates more and more deeply into relative adjectives, which at the same time acquire a qualitative coloring” [10]. Of course, there are relative adjectives, from which no poet has yet formed a comparative or superlative degree. But far from all such formations have been found, and, most importantly, there is no principled prohibition of forms of gradation from any relative adjective in the language, giving it a qualitative, that is, variable, mobile content.

Thus, the category of the relative measure of the quality of adjectives (comparative/superlative/elative forms) is included in the grammatical categories of the Ukrainian language. It occupies an intermediate place between morphological and syntactic categories, is directly manifested at such levels of language

structure as lexical-semantic, word-formation, morphological and syntactic, and also contains a corresponding pragmatic charge, the potential for use to create a special expression, economy of speech means. Non-normative gradation of adjective and adverb forms and their non-compliance with the grammatical norms of the Ukrainian language reflects hidden linguistic resources and opportunities.

Non-normative occasional results of morphological derivation demonstrate the actualization of grammatical potentialities and filling of the "empty cells" of the morphological paradigm of the adjective. Any word-formation innovation, no matter how much it violates the systematicity of word formation and the statics of codified norms, is always firmly based on national linguistic traditions, on national linguistic wealth. The word-formation specificity of comparative and superlative grammemes is determined by the number of affixes that convey the modification of a qualitative feature.

9.4 FEATURES OF STUDYING THE ADJECTIVE IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE COURSE "UKRAINIAN AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE": PROBLEM SITUATIONS IN THE STUDY OF ATYPICAL FORMS OF THE ADJECTIVE OF THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE BY FOREIGN STUDENTS

The adjective as a part of the language, characterized by a number of lexical-word-forming, semantic and grammatical features, characteristic only of the Ukrainian language, causes certain difficulties in its study by foreign citizens. The question also arises of how to optimize the learning process and make it effective.

A significant number of lexical innovations, including non-normative comparative forms of adjectives, are gradually becoming the property of a wide language practice and literary language as a whole from a narrowly specialized sphere of functioning, which necessitates the development of a special methodology in the study of atypical grammatical phenomena in the sphere by foreign students.

At the initial stage of studying the adjective of the Ukrainian language, foreign students get acquainted with the features of the grammatical categories of the gender, number and case of the adjective and their dependence on the grammatical categories of the noun, with which the adjective agrees; with the lexical and grammatical categories of the adjective and the features of the formation of each of the degrees of comparison, their typical means of implementation. After understanding the system of typical uses, it is worth paying attention to the pragmatic level, in particular the expression of evaluative values in communicative situations.

During the study of the adjective, the teacher emphasizes that adjectives agree with nouns in gender, number and case, and comparison degrees are formed only from qualitative adjectives. As is known, one of the typological features of the grammatical category of comparison degrees is the ability to form them not from all adjectives. The teacher of Ukrainian as a foreign language course should add a comment that the derivational base of graded forms cannot be adjectives that do not indicate the proper feature. This applies to the group of relative adjective formations to the greatest extent. In the grammatical structure of the language, only the qualities themselves, which express the feature directly, are manifested to a greater or lesser extent. However, even such words do not always have the ability to form graded forms. This means that qualitative adjectives do not constitute a single-level lexical-grammatical category.

In textbooks on the Ukrainian language as a foreign language, the following tasks are typical:

Task 1. Read the adjectives, indicate which category of adjectives they belong to in terms of meaning.

Form the comparative degree of comparison of the adjectives.

Цегельний завод, дорогий інструмент, тонкий шар бетону, ефективний спосіб укладання асфальту.

Task 2. Form all possible forms of degrees of comparison from the adjectives below, where it is impossible to do this, explain why.

Гострий інструмент, ефективне виконання, хімічні речовини, результативний метод проектування, складне завдання, низька температура, здібний студент-інженер.

Task 3. Name a line, in which degrees of comparison can be formed from all words:

1. Сліпий, приємний, синій, гучний, білуватий.
2. Красивий, м'який, високий, глибокий, похмурий.
3. Глухий, чорний, товстий, цікавий, босий.
4. Надзвичайний, лисячий, синюватий, добрий.

The performance of the above tasks usually does not cause any particular difficulties in understanding by foreign students, however, in the process of discussing modern popular science articles, literary texts, advertising and when working with texts of various nature, foreign students have difficulties in understanding atypical forms of adjectives that form degrees of comparison contrary to the approved grammatical rules, which causes misunderstanding of certain communicative situations and dissonance of the learned rules and practical use of the Ukrainian language.

Certain difficulties in understanding the category of comparison degrees by foreign students can be caused by the traditional division of adjectives into qualitative and relative, since a characteristic tendency of the modern Ukrainian language is the attraction of relative, ordinal, possessive and pronominal adjectives to the formation of comparison degrees, which is a violation of the linguistic norm between native speakers and persons who are at the stage of mastering the language.

Actually, it is about knowledge of the spheres of human activity and communication, as well as the manipulative nature of language, which underlies its variability and subjectivity. Sometimes people, having perfect command of the language, often feel helpless in some spheres of communication due to the lack of practical skills in using the genre forms of these spheres.

Modern artistic, newspaper, advertising, Internet and even dictionary sources contain numerous forms of comparative, superlative and elative, formed in violation of the language norm, therefore, in the texts of textbooks on the Ukrainian language as a foreign language, special comments should be given on the use of such forms, e.g.: *"сонце було немилосердне – на такий сквородці навіть чорні маторжаники з гідкого тертого буякового насіння **найголоденніші** не смажать"* (V. Zatuliviter) [19]; *"Нема **нужденнішої** на землі людини, / Яка нікого у житті не любить"* (I. Drach) [20].

After these texts of poems, it is necessary to comment on the fact that the adjective with the suffix *-enn-* is graded, which can form degrees of comparison in accordance with language norms.

It should also be noted that in both examples, the grammemes of the comparative and superlative are used to actualize the meaning of a negative assessment, which is explained by the author's intention and the influence of the context – "the results of occasional derivational processes, introduced into

artistic communicative-pragmatic situations, encourage the addressee to experience, evoke feelings in him/her" [7].

In newspapers and weeklies, in advertising, atypical forms of adjectives are used quite often, e.g.: *"Ти абсолютний нуль – повторює собі ця людина, – найабсолютніший нуль. Тебе – що є, що нема – однаково"* (Т. Malyarchuk) [21]; *"От я свиня – то вже свиня! Од свиней свиніша"* (Р. Tichyna) [22]; *"Найостанніший матч у кар'єрі Андрія Шевченка"* [23] *"Найгладмурнішою жінкою року стала Кайлі Міноуз"* (M1: Onenews, 08/08/06); *"Нова суперчетвірка — найбамбінніший мікс екзотичних фруктів: лічі, фейхоа, маракуйя, гранат"* [23]; *"Найексклюзивніші новини на нашому каналі"* (1+1: TCH, 16/02/09); *"Маска Electric EG 2 ANDREAS WIIG – найтоповіша маска в лінійці Electric"* [24].

Therefore, such forms of adjectives can be considered atypical, since they are formed in violation of language norms. For students to fully understand the purpose of using metaphorical adjective forms, in addition to interpreting new meanings and assessments that have arisen in the text, the mechanism of formation of such forms should be explained. The teacher should note that the contradiction between the grammatical meaning of a certain lexical-grammatical category of an adjective and its form of the comparison degree causes a change in lexical meaning, that is, the grammatical meaning in a certain context is influenced by the lexical meaning of the word, which, as a result of this influence, begins to express an evaluative meaning.

Also, the text of the textbooks should provide comments on the functional style of speech, in which a non-normative unit is used. The presence of such comments in the texts of textbooks will contribute to mastering the complex of language genres, accepted in society, since each of them has its own set of language means and models of behavior.

For example, it is traditionally believed that the pragmatic function of words is most fully revealed in the language of fiction, in particular, we can trace the active functioning of the analyzed units in the language of poetry. The use of adjectives in a figurative meaning to model the evaluative meaning is, of course, quite common, which generally corresponds to the pragmatic orientation of evaluation – the expression of attitude towards the referent, which, as a rule, is accompanied by emotional and figurative connotations in speech.

Analysis of adjectives in texts of different genres and explanation of the specifics of the use of atypical forms of adjectives helps to find out how adjectives are used in different linguistic contexts and what meanings they convey. To conduct a text analysis of fiction texts, foreign students can be offered to use a text language analysis program, which allows you to automatically highlight adjectives in the text and conduct statistical analysis. To analyze Ukrainian fiction texts, you can use such programs as 17 Poliqarp or TextCrunch. These programs allow you to highlight adjectives in texts and perform statistical analyses, such as distribution by gender and number, distribution by degree of comparison, frequency of use, and other parameters. Analysis of adjectives in literary texts can help reveal the author's writing style, describe the characteristics of characters, and also clarify the connections between adjectives and other elements of the text. The teacher's explanation of the use of atypical forms of adjectives in different styles of the modern Ukrainian language will help foreign students master the language of the country of study, as well as skillfully use language tools in communication and to understand text features while reading, watching feature films, in professional communication, etc.

9.5 DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS OF SECTION 9

Forming the communicative skills of foreign students through the study of the evaluative potential of language units and the study of the use and understanding of such atypical forms allows us to create conditions that are as close as possible to real language communication in Ukrainian. In order to increase the interest of students and, as a result, increase the effectiveness of studying Ukrainian phraseology, we have developed a system of tasks for foreign students at each stage.

Taking into account the results of our research, the author can argue that the study of atypical forms of adjectives of the Ukrainian language (as well as other morphological parts of speech) intensifies and significantly increases the effectiveness of the process of learning to understand and use Ukrainian communicative units. These technologies improve the effectiveness of both classroom and independent work of foreign students with texts in Ukrainian and oral speech. It is very important that the study of the pragmatic potential of language units in the structure of Ukrainian as a foreign language course allows us to create conditions for the audience that are as close as possible to real communication in the foreign language. This is also noted by other researchers [2, 25].

Therefore, the reform of language education consists, first of all, in reorienting language courses to the development of language skills and abilities necessary for solving life problems, satisfying cultural requests and communicative needs, and practical activities.

Work with foreign students in an educational communicative situation should also be aimed at familiarizing them with atypical implementations of language units in certain contexts, including the grammatical meanings of adjectives.

Including special comments regarding the results of transferring grammatical forms from one type of relationship to another and interpreting new meanings that appear as a result of such transfers in the texts of textbooks and manuals on the Ukrainian language as a foreign one will contribute to the improvement of the methodology for teaching the Ukrainian language as a foreign language course.

Given the relevance of this topic, we consider it necessary to continue the development of research that will increase the effectiveness of teaching foreign students Russian and Ukrainian languages, make the educational process more interesting and diverse, and contribute to improving cognitive activity and the educational level of future specialists.

REFERENCES

1. Batsevych, F. S. (2010). *Narysy z linhvystychnoi prahmatyky*. Lviv: PAIS, 336.
2. Bezpoiasko, O. K. (1993). *Hramatyka ukrainskoi movy*. Kyiv: Lybid, 334.
3. Vykhoivanets, I. (2004). *Teoretychna morfolohiia ukrainskoi movy: Akademichna hramatyka ukrainskoi movy*. Kyiv: Univ. vyd-vo "Pulsary", 398.
4. Vinnytska, V. M., Pliushch, N. P. (2003). *Ukrainska mova: praktychnyi kurs hramatyky dlia studentiv-in-ozemtsiv*. Kyiv: VPTs "Kyivskiy universytet", 272.

5. Horodenska, K. (2005). Funktsionalno-katehoriina hramatyka ukrainskoi movy. Naukovyi visnyk Kheronskoho derzhavnoho universytetu. Seriya: Linhvistyka, 2, 92–97.
6. Horpynych, V. (2004). Morfolohiia ukrainskoi movy. Kyiv: Akademia, 335.
7. Hryshchenko, A. P. (1978). Prykmetnyk v ukrainskii movi. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 207.
8. Drach I. Bulo sobi ya ... Available at: <http://duns37.livejournal.com/348157.html>
9. Zhyzhoma, O. (2009). Rol okazionalnykh prykmetnykiv u formuvanni poetychnoho dyskursu. Linhvistychni studii, 18, 156–161.
10. Zhluktenko, Yu. O. (1971). Metodyka vykladannia inozemnykh mov u vyshchii shkoli. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola, 222.
11. Zahalnoosvitnii standart z ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi (2014). Available at: https://my.osvita.net/SiteNews.aspx?news_id=2L1WHF00EWVC
12. Zatuliyviter, V. (2004). Dizha: Poza zhanrom. Suchasnist: Literatura, nauka, mystetstvo, suspilne zhyttia, 4, 14–27.
13. Znachky na zamovlennia. Available at: <http://leoville.lviv.ua/products-ukr-15-1.html>.
14. Karpenko, Yu. O. (2010). Stupeni porivniannia riznykh chastyn movy ta yikhni funktsii. Movoznavstvo, 2/3, 41–48.
15. Klymenko, N. F. (2008). Dynamichni protsesy v suchasnomu ukrainskomu leksykonii. Kyiv: Vydavnychi Dim Dmytra Buraho, 336.
16. Koloiz, Zh. V. (2007). Ukrainska okazionalna deryvatsiia. Kyiv: Aktsent, 311.
17. Kononenko, V. I. (2009). Prykmetnyk u slovianskykh movakh. Kyiv: VPTs "Kyivskiy universytet", 495.
18. Kosmeda, T. A., Osipova, T. F. (2010). Komunikatyvnyi kodeks ukrainsiv u paremiakh: tlumachnyi slovnyk novoho typu. Drohobych: Kolo, 272.
19. Kosmeda, T. (2000). Aksiolohichni aspekty prahmalinhvistyky: formuvannia i rozvytok katehorii ot-sinky. Lviv: LNU im. I. Franka, 349.
20. Kots, T. A. (2010). Literaturna norma u funktsionalno-stylovii i strukturnii paradyhmi. Kyiv: Lohos, 303.
21. Maliarchuk, T. (2010). Oblaka. Tam de nebo. Available at: <http://simcheg.livejournal.com/6389.html>
22. Riazantseva, D. V. (2012). The Positive and the Negative Grammatical Deviations of the Adjectives of Ukrainian Language. Masova komunikatsiia: istoriia, sohodennia, perspektvy, 1 (1), 118–123.
23. Tychyna, P. H. (1991). Des na dni moho sertsia. Poezii. Kyiv: Radianskyi pysmennyk, 221.
24. Tak prosto. Available at: <http://serj-doc.livejournal.com/1025413.html>
25. Turkevych, O. (2009). Metodyka vykladannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi: rozvytok nauky i stanovlennia termina. Teoriia i praktyka vykladannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi, 4, 137–144.
26. Khaliman, O. V. (2010). Morfolohichni zasoby vyrazhennia katehorii otsinky v suchasnii ukrainskii movi: rid i chyslo. [Extended abstract of Doctoral thesis].
27. Morhunova, N., Dmytriiev, I., Ikhsangaliyeva, G., Nurzhanova, Z., Prylutska, L. (2023). Psychological and pedagogical factors in the organization of education of foreign students in the educational space of higher education institutions. Problems and prospects of training in higher school: pedagogical, philological, psychological and intercultural aspects. Kharkiv: TECHNOLOGY CENTER PC, 14–33. <https://doi.org/10.15587/978-617-7319-94-7.ch2>

28. Jisheng, B., Honghao, Y., Caijing, Z., Morhunova, N. (2023). The influence of the national mentality of Chinese students on the formation of professional and communicative competence using innovative technologies. Problems and Prospects of Training in Higher School: Pedagogical, Philological, Psychological and Intercultural Aspects. Kharkiv: TECHNOLOGY CENTER PC, 122-141. <https://doi.org/10.15587/978-617-7319-94-7.ch8>