



UDC: 811.1/2'367.624

**Markhabo I. ATADJANOVA,**

*Urgench State University named after Abu Raykhan Beruniy,  
Teacher, English Language and Literature Department Urgench, Uzbekistan  
E-mail: marxabo@urdu.uz ORCID 0009-0003-5513-4655*

*Review by DSc, Professor Iroda Kahharova, USWLU, Tashkent*

## HIND-YEVROPA TILLARIDA RAVISHLARNING O'RGANILISHI: TASNIFI, TURLARI VA LINGVISTIK YONDASHUVLAR

Аннотация

Ushbu maqolada Hind-Yevropa tillarida ravishlarning o'rganilishi semantik, sintaktik, morfologik va diaxronik nuqtayi nazardan tahlil qilinadi. Unda ravishlarning grammatik kategoriya sifatidagi geterogen tabiati yoritilib, ularni tasniflashda qo'llaniladigan asosiy tamoyillar, jumladan ma'no, sintaktik taqsimlanish, so'z yasalishi va tarixiy kelib chiqish masalalari ko'rib chiqiladi. Qadimgi Hind-Yevropa tillarida ravishlarning muzlashgan kelishik shakllari, yuklamalar, olmosh asoslari va deytik elementlardan rivojlanishiga alohida e'tibor qaratiladi. Maqolada Otto Jespersen, Rey Jekendoff, Irena Bellert, Rendolf Kvirk, Sidni Grinbaum, Jefri Lich, Yan Svartvik, Tomas Ernst, Gulyelmo Chinkve va Paolo Ramat kabi tilshunoslar tomonidan ilgari surilgan muhim yondashuvlar ham tahlil qilinadi. Tahlil shuni ko'rsatadiki, ravishlarni yagona leksik sinf sifatida emas, balki grammatika, ma'no, diskurs va tarixiy o'zgarish o'zaro ta'sirida shakllanadigan funksional soha sifatida talqin qilish lozim.

**Kalit so'zlar:** ravishlar, Hind-Yevropa tillari, ravishlar tasnifi, tarixiy tilshunoslik, sintaksis, semantika, morfologiya, grammatikalashuv, tipologiya.

## ИЗУЧЕНИЕ НАРЕЧИЙ В ИНДОЕВРОПЕЙСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ: КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ, ТИПЫ И ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ПОДХОДЫ

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается изучение наречий в индоевропейских языках с семантической, синтаксической, морфологической и диахронической точек зрения. Освещается неоднородная природа наречий как грамматической категории и определяются основные принципы их классификации, включая значение, синтаксическое распределение, словообразование и историческое происхождение. Особое внимание уделяется развитию наречий из застывших падежных форм, частиц, местоименных основ и дейктических элементов в древних индоевропейских языках. В статье также анализируются влиятельные подходы, предложенные такими лингвистами, как Отто Есперсен, Рэй Джекендофф, Ирена Беллерт, Рэндольф Квирк, Сидни Гринбаум, Джеффри Лич, Ян Свартвик, Томас Эрнст, Гульельмо Чинкве и Паоло Рамат. Анализ показывает, что наречия следует рассматривать не как единый лексический класс, а как функциональную область, формируемую взаимодействием грамматики, значения, дискурса и исторического изменения.

**Ключевые слова:** наречия, индоевропейские языки, классификация наречий, историческая лингвистика, синтаксис, семантика, морфология, грамматикализация, типология.

## THE STUDY OF ADVERBS IN INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES: CLASSIFICATION, TYPES, AND LINGUISTIC APPROACHES

Annotation

This article examines the study of adverbs in Indo-European languages from semantic, syntactic, morphological, and diachronic perspectives. It discusses the heterogeneous nature of adverbs as a grammatical category and outlines the major principles used in their classification, including meaning, syntactic distribution, word formation, and historical origin. Special attention is given to the development of adverbs from fossilized case forms, particles, pronominal stems, and deictic elements in early Indo-European languages. The article also reviews influential approaches proposed by linguists such as Otto Jespersen, Ray Jackendoff, Irena Bellert, Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik, Thomas Ernst, Guglielmo Cinque, and Paolo Ramat. The analysis shows that adverbs should be treated not as a uniform lexical class, but as a functional domain shaped by interaction between grammar, meaning, discourse, and historical change.

**Keywords:** adverbs, Indo-European languages, adverbial classification, historical linguistics, syntax, semantics, morphology, grammaticalization, typology.

Adverbs constitute one of the most complex and theoretically problematic categories in grammatical description [12; 17]. In Indo-European linguistics, their study is particularly significant because adverbial forms often preserve traces of archaic case endings, particles, deictic expressions, and earlier stages of syntactic organization [4; 14; 20]. Unlike nouns, verbs, and adjectives, adverbs cannot be defined by a single morphological or syntactic feature. They may modify verbs,

adjectives, other adverbs, phrases, clauses, or entire propositions. Consequently, modern linguistic scholarship generally treats adverbs as a heterogeneous category whose analysis requires the combined application of morphological, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and historical criteria [1; 6; 7].

The aim of this article is to describe the main scholarly approaches to the classification of adverbs in Indo-European languages and to determine how their semantic, syntactic,

morphological, and diachronic features have been interpreted in linguistic research. The research problem is based on the fact that adverbs do not form a homogeneous category and therefore require analysis through several complementary criteria.

**Introduction.** The study of adverbs in Indo-European languages is relevant because this grammatical category occupies an intermediate position between morphology, syntax, semantics, and discourse. In the oldest Indo-European languages, such as Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Latin, Old Irish, Gothic, Old Church Slavonic, and Avestan, many adverbs originated from frozen nominal case forms, pronominal stems, particles, and local expressions [14; 19; 20]. Historical linguists have therefore connected adverbial forms with the development of prepositions, preverbs, and particles. Jerzy Kuryłowicz argued that many Indo-European indeclinable could function as preverbs or prepositions and that their adverbial origin helps explain their later functional differentiation [14]. This view remains influential in diachronic studies of Indo-European grammar because it shows that adverbs are not merely secondary modifiers, but important evidence for reconstructing earlier grammatical systems.

The research gap lies in the fact that adverbs have often been described either within the grammar of individual languages or as peripheral modifiers, while their broader Indo-European development and classification have received less systematic attention. Pierluigi Cuzzolin, Ignazio Putzu, and Paolo Ramat define the Indo-European adverb as a category that must be studied both formally and conceptually [4]. Their diachronic and typological approach shows that Indo-European languages moved gradually from synthetic formations, where adverbial meanings were often expressed through inflectional case endings, toward more analytic formations involving prepositions, particles, and fixed word order [4; 18]. Therefore, the investigation of adverbs requires a framework that combines internal grammatical description with comparative-historical interpretation.

The object of the research is the category of adverbs in Indo-European languages, while the subject is the classification of adverbs according to their semantic, syntactic, morphological, and diachronic characteristics. The aim of the article is to identify the principal approaches to the study of adverbs and to show how these approaches contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of adverbiality. To achieve this aim, the article addresses the following objectives: to describe the historical sources of Indo-European adverbs; to systematize the main criteria of classification; to examine the principal semantic and syntactic types of adverbs; and to evaluate the contribution of major linguistic theories to the interpretation of adverbial structures.

The study applies a qualitative descriptive method combined with comparative, typological, and diachronic analysis. The material consists of theoretical works on adverbs and adverbials in general linguistics, Indo-European linguistics, historical syntax, grammaticalization theory, and functional typology. The analysis compares classifications proposed in traditional grammar, generative grammar, systemic functional linguistics, and typological studies in order to identify the principal criteria used for defining and grouping adverbs.

**Methods.** The classification of adverbs has usually followed four main principles: semantic meaning, syntactic function, morphological formation, and historical origin [8; 17]. Traditional grammars classify adverbs semantically into adverbs of manner, place, time, frequency, degree, cause, affirmation, negation, and modality. Structural and generative grammars classify them according to their position and scope: some modify the verb phrase, while others modify the whole sentence or express the speaker's attitude [12; 17].

Ray Jackendoff's work was important because it connected semantic interpretation with syntactic distribution [12]. He distinguished between VP-adverbs, such as manner adverbs, and S-adverbs, such as evidential or modal adverbs [12]. Irena Bellert later criticized overly simple two-class models and proposed that sentential adverbs require more detailed semantic classification [1]. Thomas Ernst developed a broader theory of adjuncts in which adverbial placement depends on scope, interpretation, and licensing [6]. Guglielmo Cinque proposed a cartographic model in which adverb phrases occupy ordered positions associated with functional heads [2].

The results of the analysis show that adverbs in Indo-European languages may be classified according to four main criteria: semantic type, syntactic scope, morphological formation, and historical origin. Semantic classification includes manner, time, frequency, place, direction, degree, modality, affirmation, negation, and evaluative meaning. Syntactic classification distinguishes adverbs that modify the verb phrase from adverbs that modify the whole clause or express the speaker's attitude toward the proposition [1; 6; 12].

**Results.** The most common type is the adverb of manner, which describes how an action is performed [17]. English often forms this class with the suffix '-ly', as in 'quickly' or 'carefully'; Romance languages use forms such as French 'rapidement' and Italian 'lentamente'; Slavic languages form many manner adverbs from adjectival stems, such as Russian 'быстро' - 'quickly'. Manner adverbs usually modify the verbal event and are close to Jackendoff's VP-adverbs [12].

Adverbs of time and frequency indicate temporal location or repetition: English 'yesterday, often, always'; German 'gestern, oft, immer'; Russian 'вчера, часто, всегда' [8; 17]. Many such forms derive historically from demonstratives, locatives, or fossilized case forms [4; 14]. Adverbs of place and direction, such as 'here, there, upward', Latin 'hic, ibi', and Greek 'hōde', are closely related to deictic systems and to the later development of prepositions and particles [19; 20].

Degree adverbs modify adjectives, adverbs, or quantifiable predicates: 'very, too, rather, quite', Latin 'valde', German 'sehr', Russian 'очень' [17]. Recent historical research on Indo-European degree morphology shows that comparative and superlative systems often interact with adverbial morphology [4; 18]. Modal, epistemic, and evaluative adverbs, such as 'probably, certainly, fortunately, and unfortunately', operate at the level of the proposition and express the speaker's judgment or attitude [1; 2; 6].

The findings confirm that adverbial classification cannot be reduced to one universal model. Traditional grammatical classifications are useful for describing semantic types, while formal syntactic approaches explain the position and scope of adverbs. Functional and typological studies broaden the analysis by showing that adverbial meanings may be expressed through different grammatical categories across languages [3; 7; 16]. Diachronic research is especially important for Indo-European languages because many adverbial forms originate from older nominal, pronominal, and particle-based structures [4; 14; 20].

**Discussion.** Otto Jespersen treated adverbs as words connected with modification and subordination [13], while Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik gave one of the most detailed classifications of English adverbials, distinguishing adjuncts, disjuncts, and conjuncts [17]. Michael Halliday, working in systemic functional linguistics, emphasized the role of adverbial groups in expressing circumstances such as time, place, manner, cause, and degree [9].

In formal linguistics, Jackendoff's distinction between sentence adverbs and predicate adverbs became a major point of reference [12]. Bellert expanded the analysis of sentential adverbs by showing that their meaning cannot be reduced to a simple opposition between sentence and predicate modification [1]. Ernst argued that adverbial adjuncts are licensed by semantic interpretation and scope relations rather than by numerous special syntactic rules [6]. Cinque's theory of adverbs and functional heads placed adverbs within a universal hierarchy of clausal structure [2].

Historical and typological linguists such as Joseph Greenberg, Bernard Comrie, Talmy Givón, R. M. W. Dixon, Alexandra Aikhenvald, Bernd Heine, Tania Kuteva, and Paolo Ramat have shown that adverbs are not always a stable universal word class [3; 5; 7; 11; 18]. In many languages, adverbial functions are expressed by nouns, verbs, adjectives, particles, or case-marked phrases [7; 16]. This observation is especially relevant for Indo-European studies because many Indo-European adverbs developed through grammaticalization from older lexical or inflectional material [4; 11; 15].

**Conclusion.** In conclusion, the study confirms that adverbs in Indo-European languages cannot be interpreted as a single, uniform lexical or morphological class. They represent a broad functional domain in which morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and diachronic development intersect [4; 6; 12]. The analysis has shown that adverbs may be classified according to several complementary criteria:

semantic meaning, syntactic scope, morphological formation, and historical origin. This multidimensional classification is necessary because adverbs can function both as modifiers of verbal predicates and as operators affecting the whole clause or proposition [1; 2; 12].

The findings also demonstrate that many Indo-European adverbs preserve earlier inflectional and deictic structures, while their modern functions reveal the ways in which languages organize modification, scope, evaluation, and discourse relations [14; 19; 20]. The contributions of Jackendoff, Bellert, Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, Svartvik, Ernst, Cinque, Cuzzolin, Putzu, Ramat, and other scholars indicate that a comprehensive classification of adverbs must integrate both synchronic description and diachronic explanation [1; 2; 4; 6; 12; 17; 18]. From a theoretical point of view, the study of adverbs is significant because it clarifies the relationship between lexical categories and functional domains, as well as between inherited grammatical forms and later syntactic developments.

Thus, the analysis of adverbs in Indo-European languages contributes to a broader understanding of grammatical change, typological variation, and the interaction between form and meaning. Further research may focus on the comparative study of adverbial systems in separate Indo-European branches, the grammaticalization of adverbial particles, and the relationship between adverbs, prepositions, and discourse markers in both ancient and modern languages.

#### REFERENCES

1. Bellert I. On Semantic and Distributional Properties of Sentential Adverbs // *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1977. Vol. 8, № 2. P. 337–351.
2. Cinque G. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 288 p.
3. Comrie B. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981. 264 p.
4. Cuzzolin P., Putzu I., Ramat P. The Indo-European Adverb in Diachronic and Typological Perspective // *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 2006. Bd. 111. P. 1–38.
5. Dixon R. M. W. *Where Have All the Adjectives Gone? and Other Essays in Semantics and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton, 1982. 270 p.
6. Ernst T. *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 555 p.
7. Givón T. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1984. 500 p.
8. Greenbaum S. *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. London: Longman, 1969. 256 p.
9. Halliday M. A. K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold, 1994. 434 p.
10. Harris A. C., Campbell L. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 488 p.
11. Heine B., Kuteva T. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 387 p.
12. Jackendoff R. S. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1972. 400 p.
13. Jespersen O. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1924. 359 p.
14. Kuryłowicz J. *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1964. 243 p.
15. Lehmann C. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München: LINCOM Europa, 1995. 171 p.
16. Lyons J. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968. 519 p.
17. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman, 1985. 1779 p.
18. Ramat P. *Typological Comparison and Linguistic Reconstruction // The Indo-European Languages / ed. by A. G. Ramat, P. Ramat*. London: Routledge, 1998. P. 1–20.
19. Schwyzler E. *Griechische Grammatik*. Bd. 1. München: C. H. Beck, 1939. 844 S.
20. Delbrück B. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Bd. 1–3. Strassburg: Trübner, 1893–1900.