

## **SINTAGMATIC AND PARADIGMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN LINGUAL UNITS**

Fergana State University, 4<sup>th</sup> year of student

Orifjonova Mushtariybegim Alisher kizi

mushtariybegimorifjonova@gmail.com

Fergana State University, EFL teacher

Uktamova Mohigul Khamidullo kizi

uktamovamoxigul@gmail.com

**ANNOTATION:** This article explores the significance of hierarchical levels within language units and their expressive implications. It also examines the hierarchical relationship between levels, language, and speech within the language system, highlighting insights drawn from the principles of paradigmatic and syntagmatic laws.

**ANNOTATSIYA:** Ushbu maqola til birliklari ichidagi ierarxik darajalarning ahamiyati va ularning ifodali ta'sirini o'rganadi. Shuningdek, u til tizimidagi darajalar, til va nutq o'rtasidagi ierarxik munosabatlar, paradigmatic va sintagmatic tamoyillardan kelib chiqadigan tushunchalarni izohlaydi.

**АННОТАЦИЯ:** В этой статье исследуется значение иерархических уровней внутри языковых единиц и их выразительные значения. Он так же исследует иерархические отношения между уровнями, языком и речью внутри языковых системы, подчеркивая идеи, извлеченные из принципов парадигматических и синтагматических законов.

**KEY WORDS:** Hierarchical level, syntagmatic, paradigmatic, morphemic, communicative, lexeme, paradigm, root.

**KALIT SO'ZLAR:** Ierarxik daraja, sintagmatic, paradigmatic, morfemik, aloqaviy, leksema, pradigma, ildiz.

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:** Иерархический уровень, синтагматический, парадигматический, морфемный, коммуникативный, лексема, парадигма, корень.

In contemporary linguistic research, the focus remains on structural analyses of language and speech, examining both paradigmatic and syntagmatic aspects. This approach also involves investigating morphemes, units, and hierarchical relationships. It is crucial to recognize the importance of attitude in this field. As linguistics evolves, there is a growing emphasis on defining language and speech units and understanding their interrelations across various levels. This necessitates ongoing development within linguistics and fostering integration with other disciplines.

It is a scientific study focused on analyzing the morpheme unit and its hierarchical relationship within sentences. This research is carried out in prestigious scientific centers and educational institutions worldwide, such as Columbia University, the University of California, Harvard University, Sorbonne University, Humboldt University, Oxford University, Moscow State University, Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies, Kazakh National University, and also at the Uzfa Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature, and Folklore in Uzbekistan

Contemporary linguistic research covers a variety of areas related to learning, including the examination of hierarchical relationships among morpheme units within sentences. This research aims to describe the characteristics and perfect mutual hierarchical relationships among linguistic units.

Language elements differ from each other in various ways: paradigmatic (which involves associations), syntagmatic (the actual relationship between elements), and graded (in terms of accessing relations from a simpler to a more complex unit).

One crucial distinction between language and speech units lies in their organizational structures. Language units, found within paradigms, offer choices for selection, while speech units are arranged in syntagms, where they are combined sequentially. Language units exhibit a property of mutual resemblance. For instance, the phoneme [a] shares similarities with [o], and [i] with [e], but not with dissimilar phonemes like [q], as they belong to distinct consonant and vowel systems. Units that

resemble each other possess common features, such as the shared characteristic of “word-to-word connection” among case forms, yet they also possess unique traits; for example, the possessive case transforms a noun, while the accusative case links a noun to a verb.

A paradigm is a system of linguistic units bound together by shared characteristics, necessitating one another while differing in their individual features. It comprises at least two members of the same linguistic level. The interaction among the members of a paradigm is referred to as paradigmatic relationship.

Paradigmatic relations can be classified into distinct types based on the linguistic elements involved. The primary categories of paradigmatic relations are:

1. **Morphological Paradigms:** These relations operate at the morphological level, involving the selection of a specific morpheme within a word over others that could occupy the same position. Morphological paradigms encompass both inflectional and derivational morphemes.
2. **Lexical Paradigms:** These relations occur at the lexical level and entail choosing one word over others that could occupy the same structural position. Examples of lexical paradigms include synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, and hypernyms.
3. **Syntactic Paradigms:** These relations operate at the syntactic level, where one syntactic structure is chosen over others for a given position within a sentence. Syntactic paradigms involve variations in word order, the distinction between passive and active voice, and different sentence structures.

Paradigms can vary across phonetic, lexical, morphological, and syntagmatic dimensions, depending on the linguistic level of the system. According to Ferdinand de Saussure's interpretation, syntagmatic communication primarily concerns the sequential arrangement of language units along a horizontal axis.

This type of communication exists both in written and spoken language, as the capability for syntagmatic communication is inherent in language units. For instance, a lexeme expressing subjectivity can combine syntagmatically with morphemes indicating number, but not with morphemes like [-er]. Similarly, the verb [stop-] can

form syntagmatic combinations with morphemes denoting aspect, mood, and tense, but not with morphemes related to possession or derivation typically associated with nouns.

Lexical units, such as stems and suffixes, also exhibit syntagmatic relationships. For lexical units to form syntagmatic connections, there needs to be semantic coherence and association between them. Consider the phrase “Iron spoon” here, “spoon” denotes an object made of a material, and “iron” specifies that material. There are logical and social connections between the meanings conveyed by these words, and they are used literally in this combination. However, in the compound “Iron power” the word “iron” is employed figuratively since “power” is not a physical substance. The syntagmatic relationship in “Iron power” is non-literal and less conventional. Thus, while syntagmatic relationships are realized in speech, the potential for such relationships is inherent in language units.

Syntagmatic relations encompass various types based on the linguistic units involved. These types include:

1. **Sentence Word Order:** The arrangement of words in a sentence follows specific syntactic rules. For instance, in English, the standard word order is Subject-Verb-Object (SVO), as demonstrated in the sentence “The cat (subject) chased (verb) the mouse (object).”
2. **Morpheme Ordering in Words:** Morphemes, the smallest units of meaning in language, can be either free (able to stand alone as words, like “book” or “dog”) or bound (attached to free morphemes to convey meaning, like “-s” for plural or “-ed” for past tense). Syntagmatic relations at the morpheme level involve ordering morphemes within a word to convey meaning. For example, in “unhappiness”, the bound morpheme “un-” precedes the root morpheme “happy”, with the bound morpheme “-ness” following it.
3. **Phoneme Sequencing in Speech:** Phonemes, the smallest units of sound in language, are sequenced to form words and utterances. For example, in the

word “cat”, the phonemes /k/, /æ/, and /t/ occur in a specific sequence to produce the word.

In conclusion, the exploration of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations within linguistic analysis reveals the intricate interplay between structural organization and semantic variation in language. Syntagmatic relations elucidate the linear arrangement of linguistic units, facilitating the formation of coherent sequences like phrases and sentences. Conversely, paradigmatic relations unveil the substitutive potential between units, offering a spectrum of semantic choices that shape the stylistic nuances and expressive breadth of language.

Syntagmatic analysis serves as the foundation of linguistic structure, pivotal for comprehending the grammatical organization of language and its practical applications in text analysis and language teaching. Understanding syntagmatic relations not only aids in constructing meaningful sentences but also enhances our ability to navigate real-world language contexts effectively.

On the other hand, delving into paradigmatic relations enriches our understanding of language versatility and semantic depth. This depth is vital in fields like lexicography, where distinctions between synonyms and antonyms shape the usability of dictionaries, and in computational fields such as machine translation and semantic analysis, where recognizing paradigmatic substitutes ensures accurate text translations and user intent comprehension in diverse linguistic environments.

In an era of globalization and digital connectivity, the ability to discern and manipulate both syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations is indispensable. By appreciating the significance of these linguistic phenomena, we can better navigate the complexities of language, enhance communication across cultures, and drive advancements in computational linguistics for a more inclusive and interconnected world.

In summary, the thorough investigation into syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations presented in this coursework enhances not only our theoretical grasp of language but also underscores its tangible real-world implications. By merging

insights from both syntagmatic and paradigmatic viewpoints, an array of disciplines, spanning from education to technology, stand to gain considerable advantages.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Andersen, Henning. “Syntagmatic vs. Paradigmatic Relations.” *Historical Linguistics* 2001. John Benjamins, 2003. pp. 109-125;
2. Aitchison, Jean. *Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon*. Blackwell, 1987. pp. 112-130;
3. De Gruyter Mouton “Paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations”, 2000;
4. Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1933. pp. 170-185;
5. Chomsky, Noam. *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton, 1957. pp. 30-51;
6. Cruse, D. Alan. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge University Press, 1986. pp. 90-110;
7. Crystal, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press, 1995. pp. 98-115;
8. Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*. Cornell University Press, 1975. pp. 80-97;
9. Jakobson, Roman. “Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances.” *Fundamentals of Language*. Mouton, 1956, pp. 55-82.