N. Lazebna

PhD in Philological sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department
of Theory and Practice of Translation,
Zaporizhzhya National Technical
University

M. Kuznetsova

PhD in Philological sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department
of Theory and Practice of Translation
Zaporizhzhya National Technical
University

ADJECTIVES IN COGNITIVE GRAMMAR

Cognitive grammar is currently becoming popular among researchers and learners of any language. This discipline has smoothed sharp corners between "formalist" and "functionalist" approaches in linguistic theory [1]. Cognitive grammar balances between formalist and functionalist concerns, though its theoretical background is central for this research paper. There is an urgent need to study linguistic phenomenon in a broader context or apply different theories and various approaches. Thus, cognitive grammar enables us to penetrate into language depth consisting of social interaction and cognition.

In spite of the fact that grammar has often been underestimated as the field of great interest, currently there is an essential shift from considering grammar "as a system of arbitrary forms based on abstract principles unrelated to other aspects of cognition or human endeavor" to "an essential aspect of the conceptual apparatus through which we apprehend and engage the world [2, p. 15]. And instead of being a distinct and self-contained cognitive system, grammar is not only an integral part of cognition but also a key to understanding it" [2]. Therefore, an approach *to discussion of adjectives in terms of cognitive grammar* should extend limits of this phenomenon. A lack of researches in the field of cognitive grammar in relation to adjectives needs studies focused on schematic and conceptual domains of adjectives.

The issue of boundedness has been often applied for discussion of nouns and verbs [1-3]. A category of boundedness was applied to nouns and verbs in the following terms: countability was referred to boundedness in nouns and was referred to the basic category of verbs, i.e. the *aktionsart* or a type of situation expressed by a verb as states/events [1]. Therefore, a category of boundedness was related to basic characteristics of nouns and verbs. Boundedness in adjectives was not properly studied.

The **aim** of this paper is to consider the issue of boundedness in relation to adjectives on the basis of their gradability and scalarity. Another concern is that contextual modulation may influence boundedness. Thus, we are to fulfill the following **tasks**: to identify boundedness in adjectival semantics; to define gradability and scalarity of adjectives as two main taxons for determination of boundedness/unboundedness; to examine scalarity as an independent cognitive phenomenon in relation to adjectives; and specify adjectives in terms of cognitive grammar.

The basic characteristic of adjectives is gradability. Further, this category is correlated with the issue of boundedness. Therefore, boundedness refers to gradability in adjectives. The property of adjectives may be subjected to contextual modulation. Contextual modulation refers to the fact that "in ordinary speech the meaning associated with a lexical item undergoes "modulation" as a result of the context in which it is used" [4]. Cognitive basis of further study is approved by the fact that we make an attempt to define correspondences between conceptual/linguistic structure of adjectives and schematic/conceptual domains of adjectives. We referred to numerous studies, but we support and use the main ideas suggested by such scholars as R. Langacker [1; 2], J. Taylor [5] and C. Paradis [6; 7]. Their ideas are dominant for drawing parallels between thought, language and reflection of adjectives on this relation scale.

Previous researches of boundedness were mainly referred to verbal and nominal semantics [8]. The schematic structuring was studied by L. Talmy [3] and it was noted that individuation is one of the construal operations of it. The state of boundedness is one of the most important aspects of individuation. In other words, any phenomenon may have clear boundaries (or to be bounded) or have no boundaries at all (or to be unbounded) [8]. Boundedness has been rarely applied for adjectival semantics [9; 10], but the question about boundedness in adjectival semantics remains open. Carita Paradis considers boundedness as a "schematic template of high generality, which plays a role in other schematic templates, such as SCALE" [7]. In the previous works of this scientist boundedness was considered as the main characteristic of adjectival gradability. The author differentiates between two modes of construal: totality and scalarity.

We support a twofold differentiation suggested by C. Paradis and it is possible to differentiate between limit (true, sufficient) and extreme (excellent, amazing) adjectives. Scalars are adjectives with more-or-less construal of properties (e.g. nice, tall). Moreover, as it is suggested by the study by C. Paradis [6], it is relevant to differentiate between the following types of scalar modifiers: "boosters (e.g. a*wfully, extremely, frightfully, highly, jolly, very*), moderators (e.g. *fairly, pretty, quite, rather*), and diminishers (e.g. *a bit, a little, slightly, somewhat*).

C. Paradis' study was mainly based in texts of 60-s and 70-s and she managed to support her hypothesis that "different modes of construal determine the choice of a degree modifier. So, scalar adjectives were shown to choose scalar modifiers. Extreme and limit adjectives proved taking totality modifiers". C. Paradis [6] underlined properties of totality adjectives to function as scalar terms (possible-very possible) though she underlined a rigid and unbounded nature of scalar adjectives. In her later study, C. Paradis broadens her vision on boundedness and would claim that this is a flexible issue.

Further on, this study focuses on the 'scale-or-point' rationale as the distinction for boundedness in adjectival semantics. Therefore, it is relevant to consider C. Paradis [6] distinction in detail. The author came to the conclusion that unbounded adjectives or scalars describe the property as a range on a scale and bounded adjectives are point-like conceptualizations. Still, it may be argued that in case a point is denoted it is denoted on a scale. At this point C. Paradis approximators may be referred to as: "the property of the referent in question falls short of the limit implied by the meaning of the adjective" [6, p. 63]. The issue of scalarity is applied for extreme adjectives (perfect, excellent) or to limit adjectives (clean, free). The properties defined by these adjectives denote not points on a scale, but ranges on a scale. Thus, it is relevant to talk about scalarity of bounded adjectives.

Thus, unbounded adjectives refer to the properties of certain phenomenon as a range on a scale and bounded adjectives present point-like conceptualization. Moreover, boundedness in adjectives is not a stable characteristic. Dynamically, boundedness can be modulated in contexts. This implies that a border between bounded and unbounded adjectives is flexible.

First of all, we consider adjectives on a prototype level. This level implies adjectives main function to specify characteristics/properties (green, low, wise). Furthermore, in terms of cognitive grammar, adjective green exemplifies "an atemporal relationship whose single focal participant (its trajector) is a thing" [9]. Firstly, it may seem that an adjective is reflected in the yellow region of color space. Nevertheless, a color change through time evokes yellow color sensations in different points of a color area. As a result, an adjective yellow corresponds to different shades of yellow color and a question about adjective boundedness appears at that point.

For adjectives defining features or qualities of certain things there is a need to outline a certain limit specifying both "the property and the scalar position" [9]. Both of these phenomena are interrelated and should be defined simultaneously. For example, R. Langacker [1] claims: "Consider the adjective square, which describes its trajector as having a certain shape. The conceptualization of this shape resides in a number of mental operations assessing particular subparts with respect to one another: that there are four sides, that each side is straight, that opposite sides are parallel, that adjacent sides are perpendicular, and that all sides are equal in length". As a result, we can imagine constituent relationship between these parts involved. The adjectival trajector when square is a noun or adjective has the same conceptual framework. The difference is outlined by R. Langacker in the following terms: "they differ in what they profile within this base: the noun profiles the thing, while the adjective profiles the configurational assessments" [1]. Accordingly to this claim, R. Langacker underlines that "the focal participants are integrative parts of the profiled relationship".

Focal prominence is determined by R. Langacker as a certain differentiation criterion of construal; it describes the way a certain situation is depicted, but is doesn't provide a situation with certain discernable features. For example, an expression *square tablecloth* implies relationship between schematic depictions of square, making this adjective the schematic trajectory. On the contrary, it may be suggested that "the non-trajector entity may be abstract and fully specified by the adjective itself" [1]. Thus, on the example of yellow color discussed above, it is clearly seen that the trajectory is on the scale indicating certain property. In other words, adjective yellow may be considered to be a bound between an adjective and a certain region in color space.

Adjectives performing functions of trajection, establish a neutral relationship between word pairs. For example, let us compare word pairs *work **fast*** and ***fast** worker*. In accordance with R. Langacker, "*fast* locates some activity at the positive end of a scale assessing its rate of execution" [1]. Nevertheless, adverb is considered to confer focal prominence (trajector status) on the activity itself, but the adjective confers it on the actor.

Therefore, R. Langacker's paradigm implies a vision about adjectives' characteristics as a point defined on a scale. A conceptual framework for adjectives and nouns is the same for him. Both, a noun and an adjective connect certain phenomena with reality. A semantic domain is a determinant factor for every concept. Consequently, semantic meaning of a word is determined in relation to a domain. R. Langacker defines relation between a concept and a domain as "a profile". Profile contains a certain part of conceptual information which is related to presupposed knowledge. A domain for R. Langacker is a structured experience. Therefore, in accordance with Langacker's theory, further boundedness should be considered in a broader context.

From another perspective, the issue of adjectives has been complicated by their ability to belong to different semantic classes: "absolute, relative and property modifying" [11]. Thus, a logical behavior of adjectives has also been vividly discussed in theoretical grammar. In terms of cognitive grammar, boundedness of any phenomenon is of crucial importance for human cognition. Language for human cognition is a set of linguistic triggers activating conceptual patterns in human cognition. A human ability to perceive the world in different ways implies developing various correspondences between linguistic expressions and conceptual structure. Meanings of words or expressions may be perceived by humans, evolving human ability to perceive polysemy. Therefore, human mind maps out a cognitive network consisting of different conceptual domains. The content domain implies a proper perception of a meaning and schematic domain refers to configurative frames representation. Further on, these domains are structured by different modes of construal. R. Langacker defines five basic cognitive abilities of humans in the following way: "specificity, background, perspective, scope and prominence" [1, p. 195]. Nevertheless, R. Langacker doesn't understand boundedness as a "spatial or material property" [1, p. 201].

James Pustejovsky underlines a necessity to imply levels of representation to structural semantics [12]. Still, there is a certain gap in the study by J. Pustejovsky. The scholar focuses on considerations about lexical inheritance hidden in taxonomic hierarchies and correlates word's meaning with "purpose, function and mode of creation". His theory lacks of the mode construal of meanings in interaction with word's content and schematicity.

Supposing that adjectives are content words, their content domain is in the foreground. The configuration of adjectives is constructed with regard to the schematic domain. Therefore, a conceptual basis or a suitable mode of construal is created. It operates on the content part of lexemes. Boundedness is defined by C. Paradis as a "high-level schematic domain mode, which is abstract in the sense that it configures a wide range of different content domains, but at the same time it is highly concrete in that it is associated with basic experience of countability, aspectuality and gradability" [6].

Content domains have been discussed in the work J. Taylor [5]. Still, this work was not focused on considerations about configurational aspects of adjectives. A conceptual framework of adjectives should be considered in the linguistic and pragmatic contexts. Adjectives have integral characteristics in content domain and the schematic domain. A schematic domain of the combining aspects is restricted by degree modifiers. There are two main types of degree modifiers: scalar modifiers and totality modifiers. For example, scalar or unbounded modifiers are: very good-terribly good-fairly good. Totality or bounded modifiers are: completely/absolutely/almost identical. In the case of scalar modifiers, express a gradable property of the adjectives. Totality modifiers reflect a precise value of the noun and thus are bounded to those nouns. This issue was already discussed by C. Paradis, who claimed that "a valence relation between a degree modifier and an adjective is possible just in case the two items are configured as identical to each other in the domain of gradability" [6, p. 48]. Consequently, there is a need to find out types of gradable adjectives relevant to two main types of degree modifiers.

Therefore, it is relevant to define the type of degree modifier that adjective may be combined with; and the type of oppositeness designated by adjectival conceptualization [6]. Degree modifiers as decisive factors for further discussion may be justified by the necessity to establish harmonious relationship between adjective and a degree modifier. Non-gradable adjectives, such as "classical music", "pictorial alphabet" are not considered in the following study.

The issue of oppositeness is considered further on in the following paradigm: "schematic configurative mode and, in accordance with the discussion so far, it is the mode of construal of the adjective that has to harmonize with the modifier" [6]. Therefore, it is possible to differentiate between scalar adjectives (long, short, bad), extreme adjectives (perfect, brilliant), limit adjectives (dead, true, false). It is supposed in some studies that scalar adjectives have common features with antonyms. This fact is explained by adjective's property to define variable characteristics of the objects, e.g. weight, speed etc. In human cognition, a perception of a phrase 'a long skirt' the notion 'short' occurs simultaneously.

The issue of scalar adjectives is often discussed in terms of a scale range. Concerning extreme adjectives, it is evident that they are combined with totality modifiers *(absolutely terrible, totally sparkling, utterly awful)* [13]. Nevertheless, the main distinct feature is that scalar adjectives present range on a scale, while extreme adjectives do not.

D. Bolinger claims that "the fondness of exaggeration pulls many of the adjectives representing these extremes off their perches and comparing them (i.e. comparing their non-extreme meaning) then becomes possible" [14]. Consequently, "scalar adjectives can be described as implicit comparatives, extreme adjectives can be described as implicit superlatives in that they express a superlative degree of a certain feature". As a result, we can claim that extreme adjectives are gradable bounded adjectives [6, pp. 54-57].

Limit adjectives are combined with totality modifiers *(completely dead, absolutely true, almost identical)*. This group of adjectives cannot be used in comparative or the superlative *(deader, deadest)*. Conceptual domain of this group of adjectives is divided into two main parts; in other words, there are definite boundaries for limit adjectives.

Therefore, the main function of degree modifiers is considered in terms of a scalar construal or totality construal. Unbounded adjectives are harmonized by scalar modifiers and totality modifiers are connected with bounded adjectives. In other words, it is possible to claim that scalarity is the main characteristic of boundedness in adjectives. Scalarity is often discussed in terms of Johnson's study [15]. Scalarity occurs in the result of physical experience of individuals and then is transferred to nonimagistic domains. As it is claimed by M. Johnson: "SCALARITY does seem to permeate the whole of human experience, even where no precise quantitative measurement is possible". The author provides the following examples: more, less, and same are scalar values. These values define various experiences, such as number, amount of substance, which applied for a variety of experiences, including number, an amount of substance, a degree of force, the intensity of a sensation [15].

The difference between degree modifiers and adjectives can be explained in the following terms: "schematic properties of adjectives are not as salient as they are for degree modifiers. The reason is that adjectives are mainly content words and as such they are conceptualized with the content domain in the foreground and the schematic domain in the background, whereas the relation is the reverse for degree modifiers, whose schematic properties are in the foreground and are thus salient" [6, p. 54].

Specification of a degree is less complex. On the other hand, the issue of adjective gradability has been vividly discussed by numerous scientists and researchers for a long period of time. With this respect, there is made an attempt to show what is referred to gradability of adjectives.

Gradability of adjectives should be considered in relation to a standard. For example, there is a standard of height in the society. Basketball players in their height would exceed the limits of this standard for sure. Still, there is another approach to gradability implying that there is an inherent standard and some gradable adjectives should be considered in comparison with default standard (full, empty, dry).

There are also open-scale adjectives (tall, short), which have an inherent [9]. Open-scale and closed-scale adjectives can be compared with the help of applied modifiers totally and completely: a. completely full/ empty/ straight/ dry (closed-scale); b. completely long/ wide/ short/ cool (open-scale) [9]. It is also relevant to differentiate between closed-scale adjectives with minimal endpoints, for example wet and dirty. The scale of dirtiness results in a positive value (cleanness). A wet towel cannot be considered as such in case there are only a few molecules of water. Therefore, adjectives with minimal endpoint should be considered as open-scale adjectives de facto.

In the study conducted by I. Depraetere, de-adjectival verbs are studied (e.g. flatten, straighten etc). Still, the scholar claims that such kind of "adjective-to-verb derivation yields a telic verb if the root adjective is closed-scale, while yielding an atelic verb if the root adjective is open-scale (or a telic verb, if context supplies a bound)" [13]. With regard to this study, straight is an adjective with a maximal endpoint and is closed-scale and cool is open-scale adjective. Consequently, gradable and non-gradable adjectives should be considered as two different semantic classes.

The scholar K. Syrett [10] has also conducted a study in this field. In the research the following example is provided: bounded adjectives full and straight would be probably modified unlike adjectives long and tall. The latter pair of adjectives would be sooner modified by non-restricted (or scalar) adverbs. Such a conclusion was made by K. Syrett when she claimed that 30-month-old infants use their knowledge of adverb modifiers applying them to the meaning of adjectives: "For instance, when a new adjective was introduced in the context of *completely* (e.g. *These are both completely wagging*), children referred to properties that may have a maximum endpoint (such as straightness or transparency)" [10]. Infants discussed relative properties of length and tallness. Therefore, scalarity of adjectives can be acclaimed by their medium or extreme content. It may be also argued that one default reference point doesn't mean the absence of other reference points. The cognitive zero is applied in contextual modulation of bounded adjectives. For bounded adjectives there are polar anchors (in other words, minimal or maximum endpoints), though in case of unbounded adjectives medium value prevails on the gradual scale.

Another point to be argued in comparison to other studies is the supposition about absoluteness of bounded adjectives. Therefore, the study conducted by C. Kennedy [9] can be irrelevant for us. The scholars claim that closed-scale adjectives are absolute, because "their standards are fixed and thus context-independent, i.e. they do not give rise to vagueness". From another perspective, open-scale gradable adjectives depend on the context heavily; in other words such kind of adjectives is called relative adjectives.

On the contrary, it may be suggested that reference points of bounded adjectives cannot depend on the context only. For example, a maximum point for clean may be defined by the context and communicative situation. Further on, it is necessary to underline that a differentiation between bounded adjectives and unbounded adjectives should not be overestimated. This can be proven by the necessity to apply for adjectives a minimal value of "adjectiveness" in order to anchor the process of characterization of a certain process. Consequently, the issue of unboundedness and boundedness of adjectives should be considered in the context of gradability and scales points of gradability [13].

The issue of comparative and superlative forms of adjectives should be considered, because comparison has been used as the main taxon of gradability. Explicit comparatives and superlatives have common features with implicit comparatives (with regard to scalar adjectives) and implicit superlatives (with regard to extreme adjectives). The main role they play is a scale presupposition. Nevertheless, there is a lack of studies clarifying differences between differential and gradable modes.

A mental scale is occupied by scalar adjectives and extreme point on the scale is indicated by extreme adjectives. These groups of adjectives refer a certain phenomenon to a degree of comparison in contrast to a general view on what is natural of this phenomenon. For example, Jack's T-shirt is long and Ben's T-shirt is short. Consequently, these adjectives are scalar and are comparative or superlative in their essence.

Nevertheless, in human cognition the forms of comparison are perceived in a different way. Thus, "the comparatives and superlatives map on to different schematic domains and employ different modes of construal" [5]. In contrast to initial forms of adjectives, forms of comparison do not reflect a scale's point of a gradable characteristic; their main function is to position entities with regard to each other focusing on a certain characteristic. Thus, his T-shirt is longer than mine implies that a certain entity is related to another entity basing on common characteristics. Explicit superlatives imply that certain entities are related to each other in the discourse. At this point, we can claim that scale of comparatives is unbounded and the scale of superlatives is bounded.

Another interesting characteristic of comparatives and superlatives is that they cannot be compared to each other. With this respect, J. Taylor underlines that: "Comparatives are not inherently gradable but can be externally graded. This grading has to be explicitly marked and it does not affect the conceptualization of the adjective in the comparative, whose function is to locate entities on a scale" [5, p. 32]. Adjectives in the positive cannot be modified by reinforcing modifiers, though attenuating modifiers can be applicable to scalar modifiers in the positive. Consequently, comparatives may be located on a scale and at the same time be restricted by degree modifiers (e.g. much better).

There are rare cases, when explicit superlatives can be modified either by scalar modifiers or by totality modifiers (e.g. *This is the very best film I ever saw, This is the very cheapest car in the showroom*) [6]. Nevertheless, these examples were taken from researches and studies in the field of adjectives and such kind of examples can be hardly met in mass media or books.

There is a supposition, that differential modifiers can be further modified by scalar degree modifiers (for example, *enough, too, more, most* can be modified into *far, much, a lot, marginally*). In this case, we can talk about two-level grading. This process occurs on an external level of adjective conceptualization. Nevertheless, two-level degree of modification cannot be applied for adjectives, which are initially connected with a certain type of boundedness (very good, absolutely right); in this case the adjectives cannot be modified for degree (a lot very good).

In the study conducted by Timothy Clausner and William Croft [16, p. 19], it is mentioned that SCALE as the schematic domain refers to both locational and configurational concepts: "Locational concepts as *more/less* can be analyzed in terms of a shifting deictic reference point. Thus, two very fundamental image schematic concepts – gradability and quantity – can be analyzed as locational and configurational concepts respectively, profiled in a single image schematic domain of SCALE" [16, p. 21]. Such kind of vision shifts our accents for further innovative vision about relationship between mental scale and location. Thus, the authors claim that there is no need to apply quantifier in case of inherently scalar adjectives (it is enough to say: 'How big is it?' and no need to say 'How *much* bigger is it?'). The expressed ideas lead us to the conclusion that content of adjectives is on the foreground, or content domain prevails in adjectives. Still, the schematic background of adjectives cannot be denied as well. The schematic domain of gradability plays an important role for revelation of degree modifier. Therefore, a prospect of the study should be considered in terms of flexibility and changes they may invoke in the schematic domain of adjectives.

Conclusion. Current study is an attempt to broaden the context of boundedness application. Graduality is chosen as a basic category to differ between bounded and unbounded adjectives. The schematic domains play an important role in content analysis of adjectives. The salience of content of adjectives prevails over schematic domains. Nevertheless, in the process of the study it was found out that some adjectives were mainly interpreted in terms of graduality and boundedness. Reinforcing adjectives belong to such kind of adjectives. It implies that reinforcing adjectives are directed on specifying noun's degree of property and not a property of a noun.

The difference between comparatives and superlatives was shown on the example of positive adjectives. The difference was in the schematic domain. A mental scale is affected both by comparatives and superlatives; only these adjectives are exploited in the mental scale differently. Therefore, it can be claimed that a common bound for superlatives and comparatives is in the schematic mode of differentiality, though gradability endows their cognate base forms with unboudedness in the schematic domain. Thus, human cognition involves schematic domain modes of a high level. Boundedness illustrates this kind of operation. A bounded/unbounded property is reflected in human cognition as a stable part of a cognitive set-up. Those configurations, which are better perceived by humans, delimit combinations of degree modifiers and adjectives. Still, boundedness is shown as such characteristic, which can be unstable and be modulated in the contexts. Thus, adjectives may be interpreted as such, that "are more or less indeterminate between different configuration and there are others that are stable in their conceptualization, and coercion into another reading is hardly possible" [5]. In other words, bounded adjectives are often misinterpreted in unbounded readings.

Consequently, this study brings in an innovative vision on boundedness relevant to theory of lexical semantics. An important role schematic domains play is applied for well-formedness of expressions and the degree of interpretability. Configurative frames are helpful for different situations interpretation. In case an individual is able to differentiate between harmonious expressions, then it is possible to talk about his understanding about schematic domains. Thus, there is an essential gap in the studies on language and cognition. Status of schematic domains in cognitive linguistics studied in this paper is another contribution in this field.

In order to discuss boundedness in a broader context, it is relevant to discuss another question: a differentiation between scalar and non-scalar adjectives. The anchoring of adjectives scales is an interesting issue. Unbounded adjectives are medium-oriented; bounded adjectives are anchored by extremes of the scale (minimum for partial adjectives *(dirty)* and maximum for total adjectives *(clean)*. With this regard, it is relevant to claim that the supposition about "absoluteness" of adjectives requires additional clarification. In this paper it was concluded that absolute adjectives depend on context. Moreover, it was suggested to modify relative adjectives by maximizers and approximators. General polar anchors applicable for adjectives are: maximum for total adjectives and minimum for partial adjectives.

Another important conclusion is that relative adjectives trigger open or unbounded scales. The discussion about boundedness may be extended in the following way: the border between bounded and unbounded adjectives is not as rigid as it has been often claimed by the researchers and scholars. Therefore, a hypothetical supposition that boundedness of adjectives should be considered in a more flexible manner and in a wider context was proven in the result of the study. It is relevant to broaden the scope of current study and focus more on contextual modulation of adjectival boundedness.

References:
1. Langacker R. W. Nouns and verbs / Ronald W. Langacker // Language, 1987. – V. 63. – № 1. – pp. 53-94.
2. Langacker R. W. Cognitive grammar: A Basic Introduction / Ronald W. Langacker. – Oxford University Press, 2008. – 584 p.
3. Talmy L. The Relation of Grammar to Cognition / Leonard Talmy // Topics in Cognitive Linguistics. – Amstredam : Benjamins, 1988. – pp. 165-205.
4. Evans V. A glossary of cognitive linguistics / Vyvyan Evans. – Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press. 2007. – 240 p.
5. Taylor J. Old problems: Adjectives in cognitive grammar / John Taylor // Cognitive linguistics, 1992. – pp. 1-35.
6. Paradis C. Degree modifiers of adjectives in spoken British English / Paradis Carita. – Lund : Lund University Press, 1997. – 192 p.
7. Paradis C. Adjectives and boundedness / Paradis Carita // Cognitive Linguistics. – Lund : Lund University Press, 2001. – V. 12 (1). – pp. 47-65.
8. Declerck R. Aspect and the bounded/unbounded (telic/atelic) distinction / Declerck Renate // Linguistics, 1979. – V. 17. – pp. 761-794.
9. Kennedy C. Scale Structure and the Semantic Typology of Gradable Predicates / Christopher Kennedy, Louise Mcnally // Language, 2005. – V. 81. – № 2. – pp. 345-381.

10. Syrett K. 30-month-olds use the distribution and meaning of adverbs to interpret novel adjectives / Kristen Syrett, Jeffrey Lidzb // Language Learning & Development, 2010. – V. 6, Issue 4. – pp. 258-282.
11. Wales K. A Dictionary of Stylistics / Katie Wales. – Harlow : Longman, 2014. – 496 p.
12. Pustejovsky J. The syntax of event-structure / James Pustejovsky // Cognition, 1991. – V. 41. – pp. 41-87.
13. Depraetere I. On the necessity of distinguishing between (un)boundedness and (a)telicity / Depraetere Ilse // Linguistics and Philosophy, 1995. – V. 18. – pp. 1-19.
14. Bolinger D. Adjective comparison: a semantic scale / Bolinger Dwight // Journal of English linguistics, 1967. – V. 1. – pp. 2-10.
15. Johnson M. The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason / Mark Johnson. – Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1990. – 272 p.
16. Clausner T., Croft W. Domains and image schemas / Timothy Clausner, William Croft // Cognitive linguistics, 1999. – V. 10-1. – pp. 1-31.

Summary
N. LAZEBNA, M. KUZNETSOVA. ADJECTIVES IN COGNITIVE GRAMMAR
The article deals with adjectives in terms of cognitive grammar. It is focused on two characteristics of adjectives: boundedness and gradability. The study brings in an innovative vision on boundedness in adjectives relevant to theory of lexical semantics and cognitive grammar.
Key words: adjectives, boundedness, gradability, cognitive grammar.

Анотація
Н. ЛАЗЕБНА, М. КУЗНЕЦОВА. ПРИКМЕТНИКИ В КОГНІТИВНІЙ ГРАМАТИЦІ
У статті розглядаються прикметники з точки зору когнітивної граматики. У центрі уваги знаходяться дві характеристики прикметників: категорія обмеженості та категорія ступенів порівняння. Дослідження представляє інноваційне бачення обмеженості прикметників у межах теорії лексичної семантики і когнітивної граматики.
Ключові слова: прикметники, категорія обмеженості, категорія ступенів порівняння, когнітивна граматика.

Аннотация
Н. ЛАЗЕБНАЯ, М. КУЗНЕЦОВА. ПРИЛАГАТЕЛЬНЫЕ В КОГНИТИВНОЙ ГРАММАТИКЕ
В статье рассматриваются прилагательные с точки зрения когнитивной грамматики. В центре внимания находятся две характеристики прилагательных: категория ограниченности и категория степени сравнения. Исследование представляет инновационное видение категории ограниченности прилагательных в рамках теории лексической семантики и когнитивной грамматики.
Ключевые слова: прилагательные, категория ограниченности, категория степени сравнения, когнитивная грамматика.