



ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF LINGUISTIC UNITS EXPRESSING LINGUISTIC GRADATION BASED ON PARADIGMATIC AND SYNTAGMATIC RELATIONS

Nilufarxon Ravshanovna Mahmudova

Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages
Andijan, Uzbekistan

Mahmudova1076@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14227589>

ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 20- Noyabr 2024 yil
Ma'qullandi: 24- Noyabr 2024 yil
Nashr qilindi: 27- Noyabr 2024 yil

KEYWORDS

communicative process,
classification, internal and
external world, social
relationships

ABSTRACT

In contemporary linguistics, the concept of a system is associated with its function in the communicative process, and the notion of a functional system is advanced. The term "function" conveys the meaning of designation or assignment. Its invariant (syntactic function, semantic function, stylistic function) represents the value of elements used in integral relations. Various linguists classify language functions differently. These include conceptuality, reflecting the speaker's internal and external world experiences; interpersonal relationships, which restore social interactions and influence the listener through evaluation, modality, implication, and others.

In modern linguistics, the concept of a system is closely tied to its function in the communicative process, and the idea of a functional system is emphasized. The term "function" denotes meaning related to designation or assignment. Its invariant forms (syntactic function, semantic function, stylistic function) represent the value of elements used in integral relationships.

Various linguists classify language functions in different ways. Notably, M.A. Halliday divides language functions into three categories:

Conceptual: Reflects the speaker's internal and external world through experience.

Interpersonal: Restores social relationships and influences the listener through evaluation, modality, implication, and more.

Textual: Ensures the delivery of coherent speech and connected information.

The three functions of language mentioned above are considered equally significant in communication. This theory in systemic linguistics is associated with representatives of the London School of Linguistics, J. Firth [1.5] and M.A. Halliday [2.3], and is referred to as "semantic-featured systemic functional grammar."

Halliday further developed his theory by integrating it as part of a sociolinguistic framework, introducing the concepts of situation, register, and text.

In contemporary Uzbek linguistics, following the systemic-structural approach, it has been emphasized that language elements should be approached as a system, where each unit is viewed as part of an integrated whole. Taking into account that similar research is

conducted in leading schools of global linguistics, we consider it appropriate to analyze the Uzbek language system within the framework of whole-part relations. This includes identifying elements that unify into a whole and those that differentiate into parts, all within the scope of a general system (supersystem).

Language elements interact in various ways: Paradigmatic (associative) relations, Syntagmatic relations (actual relations between elements), Hierarchical relations (integration into a more complex unit). The concepts of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations [2.66] are associated with Ferdinand de Saussure. He demonstrated that two types of relationships exist between linguistic elements.

On the one hand, elements in speech connect with each other, forming relationships based on the sequential (linear) nature of language. These elements are arranged consecutively in the flow of speech. According to Saussure, this type of connection, which involves a certain linearity, is called a syntagma, and the relationship between the elements within a syntagma is referred to as a syntagmatic relationship.

On the other hand, outside the process of speech, elements with a certain commonality associate within an individual's mind, forming groups characterized by various internal relationships. These associations do not possess linearity but are localized within the individual's cognition. This type of relationship is considered an associative (paradigmatic) relationship.

Contemporary linguistics is awaiting solutions to a number of significant scientific problems. These issues cannot be resolved simply by introducing a term or concept into the field and explaining its function and meaning. Such linguistic problems require linguists to undertake extensive scientific, methodological, philosophical, and, of course, practical research. Therefore, substantial scientific studies have been conducted in the field of world linguistics, and continue to be carried out today. Despite these studies coming from different periods, their direct and indirect interconnections serve to advance general, specific, and comparative-contrastive linguistics.

As indicated in the monograph by Uzbek linguist J. Jumaboeva [5.163], the phenomenon of gradation was first interpreted as a form of interword semantic relations in Uzbek linguistics in 1989, and it was termed the phenomenon of *gradunomiya*—"...in Uzbek linguistics, the part of the overall structural composition of synonyms, homonyms, antonyms, etc., reflecting linguistic semantic relations, was artificially coined using the Latin word 'gradation' ('degree,' 'stage')." This phenomenon was first proposed as a scientific hypothesis in the 1990 dissertation by linguist R. Safarova, and further studied in detail in Sh. Orifjonova's 1993-94 dissertation on lexical gradation. The phenomenon of gradunomy was established and developed in Uzbek linguistics, while it was studied differently in Russian linguistics. In 1997, linguist O. Bozorov, in his doctoral dissertation, proposed the hypothesis that gradunomy is not only a system of interword relations but also a general type of relationship that manifests in areas such as phonetics and phonology, morphology and syntax, as well as stylistics.

Thus, gradation (gradunomy) in our research is interpreted as the gradation of a sign. It is understood as a category that unites general properties, such as degree, quantity, measurement, and action, which are reflected through special means. The category of gradation is expressed through gradation and manifests in two directions: gradation as a

mental process and its result, and linguistic gradation as a means reflecting cognitive operations. In the mental process, gradation is characterized as the process of sequential, step-by-step change in the quantitative properties of an object or the change of the object's qualitative characteristics, transitioning from one quality to another, as well as recording the result of this process.

Thus, gradation requires investigation from both semantic and structural perspectives. In the first case, the semantics of gradation refers to how gradation is expressed in language through various methods and means, in other words, the implementation mechanism of the cognitive category of gradation in language. From a structural perspective, the degree of interaction between different linguistic units and the transitions between various levels of language are studied. Structural gradation is also used in constructing hierarchical functional-semantic fields. Therefore, the semantic aspect of the study of gradation allows for the identification of the characteristics of phenomena specific to gradation, while structural gradation represents the process of understanding language.

Linguistic units expressing linguistic gradation based on paradigmatic relations can be analyzed by dividing them into the following paradigms:

Lexical explanation paradigm (based on structure and meaning);

Formal shape paradigm (based on form, similarity relation);

Semantic content paradigm (based on meaning, co-reference relation);

Functional characteristic paradigm (based on task performance, task-relatedness relation);

Structural paradigm (based on the feature of gradation, structural relationship).

The paradigms mentioned above are formed based on specific features [3.188], leading to the emergence of particular relationships. In the formal shape paradigm, the similarity relation is based on the form feature, and a paradigm is formed based on the general semantic features, which establishes a co-reference relation. Terminology with the same feature based on task performance forms a functional paradigm, where the relation of task-relatedness emerges.

The types of relationships between the members of a paradigm in the semantic field can be grouped into the following categories:

Synonymic (meaning-related) relation

Hyper-hyponymic (genus-species) relation

Holonymic-meronymic (whole-part) relation

Gradunomic (gradation) relation

Functional (task-related) relation

Antonymic relation [6.180].

As can be seen from the above, H. Ne'matov and R. Rasulov understand the similarity relation as a paradigmatic relation, while A. Nurmonov recognizes the co-reference relation as a paradigmatic relation. These two views (as well as other existing perspectives) do not contradict each other but rather complement one another. Therefore, the types of paradigmatic relations are diverse. Many linguists explain the division of the language system into smaller subsystems as *tagssystema* (subsystem), linking these subsystems to grammatical categories: the category of number, the category of case, the category of tense, etc. In linguistic literature, the term "field" is used as a synonym for a subsystem—such as lexical field, lexical-semantic field, grammatical field, and functional-semantic field. O.S. Ahmanova defines a field

as a set of interconnected elements that form a separate microsystem, while V.G. Admoni refers to a field as the inventory of elements in a system relationship. The theory of systems is constantly evolving and has started to be applied across all areas of linguistics. The unity of the phoneme-language sound system, morpheme-word formation, the unity of word-changing systems, and the lexeme as the unity of the lexical system, among others [6.130]. If we say that the world around us is built on the interrelationship (in the broad sense) of endless elements (constituents), it would not be wrong. The elements of the solar system interact with each other, and these relationships are based on the proportional laws of attraction and repulsion, occurring simultaneously. Thus, the elements of the solar system do not simply coalesce or spread apart, but are regulated by the law of attraction or repulsion. In objective reality, there is no element that exists "autonomously," without interacting with other elements. The existing (or non-existing) elements in the objective world are manifested in the relations of commonality and particularity of endless interrelationships. The elements of the objective world, at the very least, enter into common relations in one or more ways—such as vapor-liquid-solid, darkness-light, living-dead, image-background, volume-quantity, etc.

The theory of systems is constantly evolving and has started to be applied across all areas of linguistics. The unity of the phoneme-language sound system, morpheme-word formation, the unity of word-changing systems, and the lexeme as the unity of the lexical system, among others [6.130].

If we say that the world around us is built on the interrelationship (in the broad sense) of endless elements (constituents), it would not be wrong. The elements of the solar system interact with each other, and these relationships are based on the proportional laws of attraction and repulsion, occurring simultaneously. Thus, the elements of the solar system do not simply coalesce or spread apart, but are regulated by the law of attraction or repulsion. In objective reality, there is no element that exists "autonomously," without interacting with other elements. The existing (or non-existing) elements in the objective world are manifested in the relations of commonality and particularity of endless interrelationships. The elements of the objective world, at the very least, enter into common relations in one or more ways—such as vapor-liquid-solid, darkness-light, living-dead, image-background, volume-quantity, etc.

A paradigm consists of the word forms or word groups of a specific word that combine one or more categorical meanings. The concept of a paradigm is applicable to all levels of language: the phoneme paradigm, the morpheme paradigm, the lexeme paradigm, and so on. In general terms, a paradigm can be divided into phonetic, lexical, morphological, and syntactic gradation paradigms. The paradigms of language level units are further divided into continuous structural components (branches), with the phonetic paradigm, for example, showing gradation in terms of front-vowel and back-vowel distinctions, narrow, central, and wide vowels, or specific phonetic features such as front-vowel narrow—In=I1+I2+I3+I4... being observed.

The lexical paradigm also forms gradational paradigms within itself, such as the paradigms of layers, dialects, emotional colorations, euphemisms, and stylistic paradigms—such as "tal'at," "ro'y," "istara," and "farishta."

In the morphological paradigm, we can observe the use of gradational paradigms as well, including the case paradigm, the subject case paradigm, the object case paradigm, the locative

case paradigm, etc. The possession paradigm encompasses categories like possession, perspective, specificity, and control. Additionally, the number paradigm includes the singular-plural dual paradigm – *quloq, yonoq, oyoq, qirg'oa, baldoq...* "Q", *ko'z, yuz, taz, tiz, mug'uz, darz, bo'g'oz...* "Z", *kurak, bilak, eshkak, cho'ntak, eshik...* The "K" sound duality paradigm...

In the syntactic paradigm, we also observed the use of gradational paradigms: adaptation paradigms: *bizning maktabimiz, bizning maktab, maktab hovlisi*; Management paradigms, agreement paradigms, and so on.

References:

1. Firth J.R. The indicated source.
2. Halliday M.A. Explorations in the Functions of Language. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.
3. Yo'ldoshev M., Muhamedova S., Saparniyazova M. Text linguistics: teaching aid – Tashkent: "Ishonchli hamkor," 2021. – p 188.
4. Galyashina E. The indicated source.
5. Jumabaeva J. Lexical and stylistic graduonomy in Uzbek and English: Abstract of Philology Doctor. – Tashkent, 2016. – p 163.
6. Sobirov A. The indicated source. – p. 130.

