

## PARADIGMATIC AND SYNTAGMATIC RELATIONS OF WORDS

Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla qizi

*Jizzakh branch of National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek*

*The Faculty of Psychology, the department of Foreign Languages Philology and teaching languages*

*Scientific advisor: nafisateshaboyeva@jbnuu.uz*

Bebitboyeva Madina Elmurod qizi

*Student of group 401-22: madinabebitboyeva5@gmail.com*

**Annotation** *Paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships refer to fundamental linguistic connections that describe the intricate structure of a language system. This differentiation is applicable at all levels of analysis and was originally presented by Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure in 1916 as an expansion of the traditional notions of paradigm and syntagm. It will be given data about subbranches of paradigmatic as well as syntagmatic relations.*

**Key words:** *paradigm, syntagm, synonyms, antonyms, hyponymy, meronymy, neutral term, contrary antonyms, contradictory antonyms, converse and vectorial, hypernym.*

A paradigm, derived from the Greek word "parádeigma" meaning pattern or model, is a set of similar forms contrasted based on their semantic and formal characteristics. On the other hand, a syntagm is a structured syntactic arrangement of linguistic elements created through segmentation, such as sounds, words, phrases, clauses, or complete sentences. A paradigm is a collection of related concepts that belong to a category and are represented by words, such as sat, fat, hat, mat, and bat. The paradigmatic relation involves how words are grouped into categories, like nouns, verbs, and adjectives. Words in the same group can be interchanged in a sentence, such as "The dog/cat/chimpanzee bit me." Semiotics, Saussure, and paradigmatic relations are closely connected, with semiotics focusing on how meanings are created through signs. The word semeion means 'sign' in Greek. A sign consists of a concept and a sound-image, which refers to the sensory impression that the word evokes. Saussurean linguistics considers language to be a self-contained system and replaces 'concept' with signified and 'sound-image' with signifier. For example, the word 'tree' comprises the sound (/tri:/) and the mental image associated with it.

Paradigmatic relationships occur among language units beyond their co-occurrence in strings and are grounded in the criteria of selection and distribution of linguistic elements. These relationships influence the vocabulary system and involve the interdependence of words, including synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy. F. de Saussure referred to paradigmatic relationships as associative relationships because they illustrate the connection between individual elements in a specific environment. However, it was the Danish linguist Louis Hjelmslev who replaced the term "associative relations" with "paradigmatic relations. The composition of individual units, sound patterns, nuances in meaning, suggestive associations, manner of expression, range of usage, and idiomatic

usage, such as: The most commonly used word that encompasses the essential characteristics of all other words within its group. It is characterized by:

- being used frequently
- being able to be combined with a wide range of other words
- having a broad and general meaning
- lacking any suggestive associations
- being neutral in terms of style
- being able to substitute for other synonyms in certain contexts
- often being used to define other synonyms in dictionary definitions

Synonyms: according to the linguist V. V. Vinogradov that lexical synonyms have similar meanings within the language system. Contextual synonyms have similar meanings only within specific contextual conditions, as seen in the following sentences:

I'll go to the shop to buy some bread.

I'll go to the shop to get some bread.

I can't bear him anymore.

I can't stand him anymore.

Lexical Equivalents: absolute synonyms have identical meanings and stylistic characteristics, such as word-building and word-formation. Ideographic synonyms convey the same concept but differ in nuances of meaning, for example:

- interesting (exciting), (piques curiosity)
- fascinating (exciting), (piques curiosity), [extremely]
- intriguing (exciting), (piques curiosity), [unclear or puzzling aspect]
- absorbing (exciting), (holds attention for a long time), [keeps you engaged]
- gripping (exciting), (holds attention for a long time), [intriguing and captivating]

The differentiation of stylistic synonyms lies in their stylistic characteristics, particularly in their connotative elements. For example, "head" is a neutral term, while "attic" is stylistically inclined. Ideographic-stylistic synonyms vary in nuances of meaning and belong to different styles, such as "to see" conveying the power of sight and understanding, "to behold" having an elevated or archaic connotation, and "to look at" referring to that which is being seen. Sources of synonymy include the development of native elements representing various shades of common meaning, adaptation of words from different English dialects and varieties, and the incorporation of foreign borrowings. Examples of this include "fast," "speedy," and "swift," as well as "handsome," "pretty," and "lovely." Additionally, foreign borrowings like "to ask" (native), "to question" (French), and "to interrogate" (Latin), and "to end" (native), "to finish" (French), and "to complete" (Latin) also contribute to synonymy. Substitute terms used to replace more direct or harsh words, for example, "intoxicated" instead of "drunk" or "tired and emotional" instead of "intoxicated"; Related word pairs with similar meanings, such as "shade" and "shadow" or "canal" and "channel"; The creation of new words through forming processes, such as "await" from "wait" or "memo" from "memorandum."

Antonymy: antonymy is a type of relationship between words where their meanings are polar opposites. Antonyms are two or more words within the same language and part of

speech that share the same semantic field, with similar style and usage, often used together to convey contrasting or contradictory meanings. To explore the spectrum of word meanings where synonyms and antonyms interact, one can utilize the semiotic square model proposed by Algirdas Greimas, a linguist and semiotician originally from Lithuania, established the fundamentals of the Paris School of Semiotics and is considered one of the foremost French semioticians, alongside Roland Barthes.

Regarding the nature of semantic opposition:

- Contrary antonyms, also known as antonyms proper, have the following characteristics:

- They are gradable, meaning there are intermediate units between the most distant members of a set, such as cold, cool, tepid, warm, hot; never, seldom, sometimes, often, always.

- They can be compared, for example, good, better, best versus bad, worse, worst.

- They can be modified by intensifiers like very, slightly, extremely, fairly, rather, such as huge, very big, BIG, quite big, medium-sized, quite small, SMALL, very small, tiny.

They do not deny one another, for instance, "She is not beautiful" ≠ "She is ugly." The terms don't indicate independent qualities, but rather an implied standard, such as a large mouse versus a small elephant. Contradictory antonyms, or complementary antonyms, are in opposition and negate each other, such as male – female, married – single, asleep – awake, and same – different. They are not subject to degrees of comparison and always imply the assertion of the other when one member is denied. Conversive antonyms refer to the same situation from different viewpoints with a reversal of participant roles, such as husband – wife, teacher – pupil, to buy – to sell, to lend – to borrow, and to precede – to follow. These antonyms are interdependent on each other and one item presupposes the other. Vectorial antonyms (directional antonyms) are words denoting differently directed actions, features, e.g. to rise to fall; to arrive to depart; to marry to divorce; to learn to forget; to appear to disappear.

Hyponymy: hyponymy is the term used to describe the relationship between a broader, more general word and its more specific counterparts. The broader word is known as the superordinate or hypernym, while the specific words are referred to as hyponyms. Essentially, the superordinate encompasses all of its hyponyms, and all of the hyponyms fall within the same superordinate category. Hyponyms that belong to the same superordinate are considered co-hyponyms to each other. For example, "flower" serves as the superordinate to specific types such as "rose," "carnation," "tulip," "violet," "sunflower," "morning glory," and "lily," and these specific types are considered co-hyponyms to each other. Hyponymy can be described as the sense relation where the meaning of A is included in the meaning of B, or A is a kind, type, or sort of B. It represents a matter of class membership, with the upper term being the superordinate and the lower terms being the hyponyms. The hyponyms sharing the same superordinate or belonging to the same class are considered co-hyponyms, such as "chair," "table," "desk," "bed," "sofa," and "dresser." In semantics, hyponymy functions according to unilateral implication, meaning that if something is a chair, it is furniture, but if something is furniture, it may not necessarily be a

chair but could be a desk or sofa. Conversely, bilateral implication indicates synonymy, where if something is an elevator, it is also a lift and vice versa, as both terms refer to the same entity but are used in different regions.

**Meronymy:** meronymy is a semantic relationship that exists between an object and its corresponding part or whole. If entity X is the meronym of entity Y, then statements like "Xs are parts of Y" or "Y has Xs" are valid when noun phrases X and Y are interpreted generically. The opposite of meronymy is holonymy. Identifying meronymy relationships between parts and wholes is important for various Natural Language Processing tasks. Efforts have been made to automatically identify meronymy patterns from texts, but the challenge of resolving pattern ambiguity remains. Pattern ambiguity occurs when an expression encodes meronymy only within specific contexts, such as the polysemous nature of the genitive pattern "of the engine of the car is a possessive relationship, while the book of the student is not.

**Syntagmatic relation:** syntagm, derived from the Greek word *syntagma*, refers to a organized syntactic arrangement of language elements created through segmentation, including sounds, words, phrases, clauses, or complete sentences."Syntagmatic relations refer to the immediate linear connections between units in a sequence, and are considered horizontal due to their reliance on the linear nature of speech. In psycholinguistics, these terms have different meanings. Paradigmatic relations describe the mental associations between words that are part of a group of mutually exclusive items, such as "black" and "white." Meanwhile, syntagmatic relations describe the mental associations between words that frequently appear together, such as "black magic," "black tie," and "black sheep."

There are many different kinds of syntagmatic relations that the linguist has to deal with. Among these one should distinguish at least the following types:

- Those relations traditionally called selectional restrictions, that is restrictions that take the semantic features of lexical items into consideration and not so much the lexical item as a whole (they form an integral part of a Katz-Fodor type of semantics; A typical case would be the verb talk, which typically combines with a human agent); Collocations, that is syntagmatic relations between lexical items that have acquired Such a high degree of idiomaticity that the relationship does not follow from the Meanings of the said items (a typical case being the relationship between the noun Fish and the mass noun school in a school offish);

- Syntagmatic lexical relations, that is, those relations that hold between two lexical items on a syntagmatic level with cognisance of their lexical meanings, a typical Case being the syntagmatic lexical relation that holds between dog and bark. What One in fact finds in these cases, is "the creation of a single more specific lexeme to do The work, as it were, of a syntagm." (Lyons 1977,262) In the torfc-example it would Be the syntagm "sound that a dog makes". It will be

focused attention on the more typical examples in category c. Syntagmatic lexical relations should first of all be seen in contrast to their paradigmatic counterparts, meaning relations such as synonymy, antonymy and hyponymy.

Both types of lexical relation have their place in a theory of lexical semantics, reflecting Different kinds of relationships within a lexical field. For that very reason they also have A very definite importance for lexicographers, for they have to draw on his knowledge of These relations when defining a lexical item. As a matter of fact, lexicographers quite Often incorporate these relations in the definition of a lexical item, for instance when Using a synonym definition or when referring to a hyponomous relation. The same holds True for syntagmatic lexical relations: lexicographers quite often incorporate these relations in their definitions, for example, the definition of thief in THE CONCISE OXFORD DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH (Concise Oxford) (in this paper, for the sake of brevity, Only relevant parts of dictionary articles are cited):

Thief a person wh o steals, esp. Secretly an d without violenc e Secondly, these relations are characterised by some degree of prototypicality. The word Bark, even though it could apply to a number of different animal types, is prototypically Associated with dog. This prototypicality in the relationship reaches a degree where it Becomes part of the meaning of the verb bark. In a sense then one could say that a dog is The prototypical barker and that an essential meaning relation develops between the Two lexical items. Eventually it boils down to the fact that the meaning of one lexical item Is encapsulated in the meaning of another (Lyons 1977:262). In this case the meaning of Dog becomes encapsulated in the meaning of bark. Note, however, that in the case of a Polysemous lexical item such as dog it would be more precise to say that only one of the Polysemous values of the lexical item becomes encapsulated in the meaning of bark.

It is quite possible of course to have a difference of opinion on the degree of prototypicality, and these differences of opinion are often reflected in the definitions of different dictionaries, for instance the difference between WEBSTER'S THIRD NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY (Webster's) (2) and THE HERITAGE ILLUSTRATED DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (Heritage) (3) concerning the definition of bark:

-Bark l a th e short loud explosive sound mad e by a dog ; Also: a smlllar sound mad e b y some other animals

-Bar k To urter the harsh, abrup t cry of a do g ... During semantic change the specific syntagmatic lexical relation can become generalized. The definition given in Webster's indicates this (ongoing) generalization process.

The COLLINS COBUILD ENGLISH LANGUAGE DICTIONARY (Collins Cobuild) is of the opIIIIOII That we have already reached a next step in this generalization process:

-Bark l Whenadog,fox,orotheranlmalbarks,ltmakesasudden,loud Rough nols e ...

This encapsulation of meaning has a very definite relevance within a cognitive framework, for within such a syntagmatic lexical relation one lexical item calls a domain intoBeing that acts as the background against which the other item's meaning should be Understood. It should be seen as a case of conventionalising contextual meaning, something that Langacker (1987:156) explains in the following way: "From the encydropedic Nature of contextual meaning, that of conventional meaning follows fairly directly.



The latter is simply contextual meaning that is schematized to some degree and established as conventional through repeated occurrence." This would seem to be the case with the Generalized syntagmatic lexical relation dealt with in the Collins Cobuild definition Above: repeated occurrence of bark with other agents than dog leads to a new schematization and the establishment of a new (conventional) meaning. It is important that Lexicographers account for these changes in schematization when formulating a definition. Within this view it then becomes clear why one also has to deal with the concept of Prototypicality of lexical meaning, for a syntagmatic lexical relation between two lexical items more often than not reflects a prototypical meaning relation, as can be seen from the example dog x bark mentioned above. In most cases the encapsulation of meaning is unilateral. This would be the case in an example such as fish x water: the meaning of water is encapsulated in the meaning of fish but not vice versa, that is one would not define the lexical meaning of water in terms of the meaning of fish, because there is no essential meaning relation. In some cases the relation is bilateral, i.e. in the case of (hear x ear, a bilaterality clearly reflected in the definitions given in Collins Cobuild:

Hear. . . When you hear sounds, you are aware of them and are able to recognise or understand them by means of your ears.

Ear. . . The ears of a person or animal are the two matching parts of their body, one on each side of their head, with which they hear sounds.

Different types of syntagmatic lexical relation can be distinguished. I mention a few types

Actor – action : dog x bark, king x rule. Thief x steal, cholera x sling

Actor – patient: chemist x medicine, pediatrician x children

Locative : harbour x ship, bank x money; swim x water, sit x chair, sleep x bed

Instrument: buy x money, look x eye, write x pen. Bite x teeth

Action – patient: read x book, eat x food, park x vehicle. Iron x clothes Feature : snow x white, needle or pin x sharp.

In conclusion, the organization of vocabulary is represented by the paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes of linguistic structure. Syntagmatic relations determine the meaning of a word within speech flow and different contexts. Meanwhile, paradigmatic relations determine the meaning of a word in relation to other members within a subgroup of vocabulary units.

#### THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Arnold. I. The English Word. Moscow. 1986.
2. Gaybullayeva, N. D. K., & Kizi, T. N. Z. (2022). THE ROLE OF INNOVATIVE METHODS FOR LISTENING COMPREHENSION IN TEACHING LANGUAGE LEARNERS FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND MAINLY ENGLISH. Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies (CARJIS), 2(10), 8-10.
3. Lipka, L. English Lexicology. Tübingen: Narr. 2002.

4. Punga L. Words about words. An introduction to English Lexicology. 2007.
5. R. S. Ginzburg , S. S. Khidekel, G. Y. Knyazeva, A. A. Sankin A COURSE IN MODERN ENGLISH LEXICOLOGY SECOND EDITION Revised and Enlarged
6. Teshaboyeva, N., & Mamayoqubova, S. (2020). COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH TO LANGUAGE TEACHING. In МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ (pp. 409-414).
7. Teshaboyeva, N. (2020). LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY, ITS STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS IN THE NEW PERSPECTIVE DIRECTIONS. In МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ (pp. 415-420).
8. Teshaboyeva, N. Z. (2019). TEACHING ENGLISH THROUGH LITERATURE INTESL AND TEFL CLASSROOMS. In СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ, ДОСТИЖЕНИЯ И ИННОВАЦИИ (pp. 82-84).
9. Teshaboyeva, N. (2023). THE IMPORTANCE OF TOURISM IN PRESENT DAY. Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики, 5(5).
10. Teshaboyeva, N. (2023). THE MODERN INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики, 5(5).
11. Teshaboyeva, N. Z. (2023, November). Adjective word group and its types. In " Conference on Universal Science Research 2023" (Vol. 1, No. 11, pp. 59-61).
12. Teshaboyeva, N. Z. (2023, November). Modifications of Consonants in Connected speech. In " Conference on Universal Science Research 2023" (Vol. 1, No. 11, pp. 7-9).
13. Teshaboyeva, N., & Rayimberdiyev, S. (2023, May). THE IMPORTANCE OF USING MULTIMEDIA TECHNOLOGY IN TEACHING ENGLISH CLASSES. In Academic International Conference on Multi-Disciplinary Studies and Education (Vol. 1, No. 8, pp. 149-153).
14. Nafisa, T., & Marina, S. (2023). TEACHING AND LEARNING OF ENGLISH VOCABULARY IN TESL AND TEFL CLASSROOMS. International Journal of Contemporary Scientific and Technical Research, 465-469.