

## **CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF PARADIGMATIC RELATIONS OF WORDS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK**

**Melikova Elnora Shukhratovna**

Lecturer in English at the Department of Foreign Languages of the IIAU

[elnoramelikova@gmail.com](mailto:elnoramelikova@gmail.com)

+998 958182525

### **ABSTRACT**

*The study of words and relationships between them are actual issues for all times and researched by several well-known linguists. Problem of language and speech is one of the most studied topics among philologists all over the world. Prague structural linguistic circle established solid definition and identified two types of relations among words: paradigmatic and syntagmatic. According to researchers, each word in a language has some relations with the other word, its which can be substituted with it, and this relationship is called paradigmatic relationship. Paradigmatic analysis involves comparing and contrasting each of the signifiers present in the text with absent signifiers, which in similar circumstances might have been chosen, and considering the significance of the choices made. In order to explore paradigmatic relations between words, computation test can be used. As a result, the words which in absentia are identified. The choice of substitution is based on several factors.*

**Keywords:** *paradigmatic relations, syntagmatic relations, associative relations, paradigm, syntagm, paradigmatic analysis, computation test, absences, signifier, signified, substitution.*

## **КОНТРАСТИВНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ПАРАДИГМАТИЧЕСКИХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ СЛОВ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ**

### **АННОТАЦИЯ**

*Изучение слов и взаимосвязей между ними - актуальная проблема на все времена и исследовалась несколькими известными лингвистами. Проблема языка и речи - одна из самых изучаемых тем среди филологов всего мира. Пражский структурный лингвистический кружок установил твердое определение и выделил два типа отношений между словами: парадигматические и синтагматические. По мнению исследователей, каждое слово в языке имеет некоторые отношения с другим словом, которое может быть им заменено, и это отношение называется парадигматическим отношением. Парадигматический анализ включает сравнение и противопоставление каждого из означающих, присутствующих в тексте, с*

отсутствующими означающими, которые в аналогичных обстоятельствах могли бы быть выбраны, и рассмотрение значимости сделанного выбора. Чтобы изучить парадигматические отношения между словами, можно использовать вычислительный тест. В итоге слова, которые заочно опознаются. Выбор замены основан на нескольких факторах.

**Ключевые слова:** парадигматические отношения, синтагматические отношения, ассоциативные отношения, парадигма, синтагма, парадигматический анализ, вычислительный тест, отсутствия, означающее, означаемое, замещение.

## **INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILIDAGI SO'ZLAR ORASIDAGI PARADIGMATIK MUNOSABATLARINING QIYOSIY TAHLILI**

### **ANNOTATSIYA**

So'zlarni va ular o'rtasidagi munosabatlarni o'rganish barcha davrlar uchun dolzarb masala bo'lib, bir qancha taniqli tilshunos olimlar tomonidan tadqiq qilingan. Til va nutq muammosi butun dunyo filologlari orasida eng ko'p o'rganiladigan mavzulardan biridir. Praga struktur lingvistik maktabi bu borada qat'iy ta'rifni berdi va so'zlar o'rtasidagi munosabatlarning ikki turini aniqladi: paradiqmatik va sintagmatik aloqalar. Tadqiqotchilarning fikricha, tildagi har bir so'z boshqa bir so'z bilan o'rin almasha olish munosabatiga ega bo'lib, bu munosabat paradiqmatik munosabat deyiladi. Paradiqmatik tahlil matnda mavjud bo'lgan har bir belgini o'xshash sharoitlarda tanlangan bo'lishi mumkin bo'lgan va mavjud bo'lmagan ko'rsatkichlar bilan solishtirish va qarama-qarshi qo'yishni va tanlanganlarning ahamiyatini ochib berishni o'z ichiga oladi. So'zlar orasidagi paradiqmatik munosabatlarni o'rganish uchun hisoblash testidan foydalanish mumkin. Natijada, mavhum so'zlar aniqlanadi. Almashtiriladigan so'zni tanlash bir necha omillarga asoslanadi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** paradiqmatik munosabatlar, sintagmatik munosabatlar, assotsiativ munosabatlar, paradiqma, sintagma, paradiqmatik tahlil, hisoblash testi, mavhumlik, belgilovchi, belgilanuvchi, almashtirish.

### **INTRODUCTION.**

As a complex system, language is divided into some levels according to particular features of words. Words in all languages relate to each other despite their different levels. This relationship can be described in two terms: paradigmatic and syntagmatic. A paradigmatic relationship refers to the relationship between words that are the same parts of speech and which can be substituted for each other in the same position within a given sentence. A syntagmatic relationship refers to the

relationship a word has with other words that surround it. As for any other phenomenon in the world, the existence of paradigmatic relations among words calls for some kind of explanation – or perhaps several kinds of explanation. Every item of language has a paradigmatic relationship with every other item, which can be substituted for it. Paradigmatic (vertical) relations are those that bind the elements of a group or a class of lexemes – “sets of intersubstitutable elements” – from paradigm of a single word to whole lexical fields [1]. Lexical items so related stand in opposition or contrast to each other and help to define the meaning of each other.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW.**

*Researches on* paradigmatic relations began in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and in the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is connected with the name of Ferdinand de Saussure, a well-known activist of Prague linguistic school. He was concerned exclusively with three sorts of systemic relationships: that between a signifier and a signified; those between a sign and all of the other elements of its system; and those between a sign and the elements, which surround it within a concrete signifying instance [2]. He emphasized that meaning arises from the differences between signifiers; these differences are of two kinds: syntagmatic (concerning positioning) and paradigmatic (concerning substitution). Saussure called the latter associative relations [3]. But Roman Jakobson’s term is now used. The distinction is a key one in structuralist semiotic analysis. These two dimensions are often presented as ‘axes’, where the horizontal axis is the syntagmatic and the vertical axis is the paradigmatic. The term “paradigmatic relation” was introduced by Louis Helmsley. Ferdinand de Saussure, who established the opposition between the two types of relations in structuralist linguistics, used the term “associative relation” for what Helmsley called “paradigmatic relation”. Huddleston and Pullum call a paradigm “the set of inflectional forms of a variable lexeme” [4]. Thus, broadly, a paradigm is understood as a set of forms of a given word. A paradigm may also be defined narrower as a set of forms within a certain category. Thus, in the textbook on grammatical analysis by Kroeger a paradigm is defined as “a set of forms which includes all the possible values for a particular grammatical feature” [5].

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.**

Paradigmatic relationships can operate on the level of the signifier, the signified or both. A paradigm is a set of associated signifiers or signified which are all members of some defining category, but in which each is significantly different. In natural language, there are grammatical paradigms such as verbs or nouns. According to Langholz Leymore, paradigmatic relations are those which belong to the same set

by virtue of a function they share... A sign enters into paradigmatic relations with all the signs, which can also occur in the same context but not at the same time [6]. In a given context, one member of the paradigm set is structurally replaceable with another. Other famous linguists Silverman and Torode claim that signs are in paradigmatic relation when the choice of one excludes the choice of another [7]. The use of one signifier rather than another from the same paradigm set shapes the preferred meaning of a text. Paradigmatic relations can thus be seen as contrastive. Saussure's notion of "associative" relations was much broader and less formal than what is normally meant by "paradigmatic" relations. Saussure referred to "mental association" and included perceived similarities in form (e.g. homophones) or meaning (e.g. synonyms). Such similarities were heterogeneous and ranged from strong to slight, and might refer to only part of a word (such as a shared prefix or suffix). He noted that there was no end (or commonly agreed order) to such associations [8].

### **ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.**

Paradigmatic analysis involves comparing and contrasting each of the signifiers present in the text with absent signifiers which in similar circumstances might have been chosen, and considering the significance of the choices made. It can be applied at any semiotic level, from the choice of a particular word, image or sound to the level of the choice of style, genre or medium. The use of one signifier rather than another from the same paradigm is based on factors such as technical constraints, code (e.g. genre), convention, connotation, style, rhetorical purpose and the limitations of the individual's own repertoire. The analysis of paradigmatic relations helps to define the 'value' of specific items in a text.

Some semioticians refer to the "commutation test" which can be used in order to identify distinctive signifiers and to define their significance - determining whether a change on the level of the signifier leads to a change on the level of the signified. Its origins lie in a linguistic test of substitution applied by the Prague Structuralists (including Roman Jakobson). In order to identify its phonemes and their "distinctive features" within a language, linguists experimented with changes in the phonetic structure of a word in order to see at what point it became a different word. The original commutation test has evolved into a rather more subjective form of textual analysis. Roland Barthes refers to using the commutation test to divide texts into minimal significant units, before grouping these units into paradigmatic classes [9]. To apply this test a particular signifier in a text is selected. Then alternatives to this signifier are considered. The effects of each substitution are considered in terms of how this might affect the sense made of the sign. This might involve imagining the

use of a close-up rather than a mid-shot, a substitution in age, sex, class or ethnicity, substituting objects, a different caption for a photograph, etc. It could also involve swapping over two of the existing signifiers, changing their original relationship. According to Barthes, the influence of the substitution on the meaning can help to suggest the contribution of the original signifier and also to identify syntagmatic units [10]. The commutation test can identify the sets (paradigms) and codes to which the signifiers used belong. For instance, if changing the setting used in an advertisement contributes to changing the meaning then ‘setting’ is one of the paradigms; the paradigm set for the setting would consist of all of those alternative signifiers which could have been used and which would have shifted the meaning. Wearing jeans to a job interview will be interpreted differently from “power dressing”. The commutation test may involve any of four basic transformations, some of which involve the modification of the syntagm. However, the consideration of an alternative syntagm can itself be seen as a paradigmatic substitution.

Paradigmatic relations are the oppositions and contrasts between the signifiers that belong to the same set from which those used in the text were drawn. Semioticians often focus on the issue of why a particular signifier rather than a workable alternative was used in a specific context: on what they often refer to as “absences”. Saussure noted that a characteristic of what he called “associative” relations - what would now be called paradigmatic relations - was that (in contrast to syntagmatic relations) such relations held “in absentia” - in the absence from a specific text of alternative signifiers from the same paradigm. He also argued that signs take their value within the linguistic system from what they are not (1983, 1974). There are popular sayings in English concerning two kinds of absences: we refer to “what goes without saying” and “what is conspicuous by its absence”. What “goes without saying” reflects what it is assumed that you “take for granted” as “obvious” [11]. Paradigmatic analysis involves comparing and contrasting each of the signifiers present in the text with absent signifiers, which in similar circumstances might have been chosen, and considering the significance of the choices made. It can be applied at any semiotic level, from the choice of a particular word, image or sound to the level of the choice of style, genre or medium. The use of one signifier rather than another from the same paradigm is based on factors such as technical constraints, code (e.g. genre), convention, connotation, style, rhetorical purpose and the limitations of the individual’s own repertoire. The analysis of paradigmatic relations helps to define the “value” of specific items in a text.

There is given two sentences taken from two famous Uzbek and English novels, “Shaytanat” by T. Malik and “Godfather” by M. Puzio respectively. There has been



used computation test method in order to find out “absentias” and clarify contrastive paradigmatic relations among words in each sentence.

*Xotiningizning o’limida mening zarracha aybim yo’q. Siz mening ziyofatlarimni gullatar edingiz. Sizni yo’qotishdan men nima naf ko’rarkanman? Aksincha zarar ko’rdim. Siz kimgadir yoqmay qolgansiz [12].*

This sentence is taken from first series of “Shaytanat” books and told by Asadbek, main hero of the novel, to Elchin, a singer and Asadbek’s future son in-law. At that time, they were neither relative or close each other. It can be seen from the choice of words which speaker said. In order to analyze it briefly, we used a table.

**Table 1.**

Subject	Determiner	Object	Predicate
<i>Siz</i>	<i>mening</i>	<i>ziyofatlarimni</i>	<i>gullatar edingiz</i>
<b>Personal Pronoun</b>	<b>Objective pronoun</b>	<b>Noun</b>	<b>Verb</b>
<i>Sen, San, sizlar</i>	<i>Bizning, maning</i>	<i>Bazmlarimni, Bayramlarimni, O’tirishlarimni, Taziyalarimni</i>	<i>Yashnatar edingiz, Qizdirar edingiz, Sovutar edingiz, Buzar edingiz</i>

As it is seen from the table, it is simple sentence and consists of four parts of sentence. The subject and determiner of the sentence are introduced with pronoun, predicate with verb and object with noun in accusative case. The fourth row of the table presents the words or paradigms, which can be substituted with the words in a given sentence. They include both synonyms and antonyms. All the words given in the fourth row are “absentias”, which was not written but can be exchanged. If so why they were not put. Because they cannot suitable for the situation, style of the novel and fulfill the meaning. Take the word “taziyalarimni” as an example. It is the antonym of the word “ziyofat” and can replace it. However, it is not relevant for the context. We know that Elchin is a singer and singers are usually invited to the parties not to funerals. Therefore, it is not suitable way for this context. The second example is taken from “Godfather” and shows particularity of English word choice:

*The first one to see Johnny Fontane enter the garden was Connie Corleone. She forgot her bridal dignity and screamed, “Johnnie”. Then she ran into his arms. He hugged her tight and kissed her on the mouth, kept his arm around her as others came up to greet him [13].*

**Table 2.**

Subject	Predicate 1	Determiner	Modifier	Object	Predicate 2		
<i>She</i>	<i>forgot</i>	<i>her</i>	<i>bridal</i>	<i>dignity</i>	<i>and</i>	<i>screamed,</i>	<i>“Johnnie”</i>
Subject pronoun	Verb	Possessive adjective	Adjective	Noun	Conj.	Verb	Proper noun
<i>he, I, we, you, they, Connie</i>	<i>pass over, overlook, remember, recall</i>	<i>his, my, our, their, your, Connie’s</i>	<i>wedding, nuptial, funeral</i>	<i>formality, rank, station, worth</i>	<i>then, but, also</i>	<i>shout, call, yell, cry, holler, silence, hush, whist</i>	

It is obvious from the table that it is compound sentence, which is consisted of two predicates, *forgot* and *screamed* respectively. The subject is pronoun and there are seven parts of sentence altogether. The fourth row demonstratives “absentias” of the sentence. Let’s take one word from the sentence and discuss, for example, “*screamed*”. It is the second predicate and has several synonyms and antonyms. “*To scream,*” means a loud, emphatic exclamation of extreme emotion. Its synonyms *call, shout, yell, cry and holler* have more negative meaning than *scream* like to utter a sudden and loud cry to attract attention and animate others, etc. If we come back to the context, we can see that it is a wedding party and the speaker screamed from happiness. The next sentence proves it that she hugged and kissed him. These entire evidence claims that writer had to use positive verb and he did so.

**CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATIONS.**

Overall, all parts of the sentence have several alternative equivalents and paradigmatic relationships are about substitution. A paradigmatic relationship involves signs that can replace each other, usually changing the meaning with the substitution. Paradigmatic analysis involves comparing and contrasting each of the signifiers present in the text with absent signifiers, which in similar circumstances might have been chosen, and considering the significance of the choices made. The use of one signifier rather than another from the same paradigm is based on factors such as technical constraints, genre, convention, connotation, style, rhetorical purpose

and the limitations of the individual's own repertoire. The analysis of paradigmatic relations helps to define the value of specific items in a text. According to results of paradigmatic analysis of the sentences, the Uzbek language has more flexible a changeable sentence structure and the synonyms have almost the same meaning can be substitutable easily. While the English language has strict sentence structure and synonyms with special meaning.

## REFERENCES

1. Lyons J. *Language and Linguistics. An Introduction* – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 2002. – P. 96.
2. Silverman K. *The Subject of Semiotics*. – New York: Oxford University Press. – 1983. – P. 10
3. Saussure F. de. *Course in General Linguistics* (trans. Wade Baskin). – London: Fontana/Collins, 1974, P. 124.
4. Huddleston R. Pullum G.K. *A student's introduction to English Grammar*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 2005. – P. 29.
5. Kroeger P.R. *Analyzing grammar: An introduction* – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 2004. – P. 252.
6. Langholz Leymore V. *Hidden Myth: Structure and Symbolism in Advertising*. – New York: Basic Books. – 1975. – P. 8.
7. Silverman D., Brian Torode B. *The Material Word: Some Theories of Language and its Limits*. – London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. – 1980. – P. 255.
8. Saussure F. de. *Course in General Linguistics* (trans. Roy Harris). – London: Duckworth. – 1983. – P. 124.
9. Barthes R. *Elements of Semiology* (trans. Annette Lavers & Colin Smith). – London: Jonathan Cape. – 1967. – P. 48.
10. Barthes R. *The Fashion System* (trans. Matthew Ward & Richard Howard). London: Jonathan Cape. – 1985. – P. 19-20.
11. Chandler D. *Semiotics for Beginners. Paradigmatic Analysis*. 12/09/2020 18:16:08
12. Malik T. *Shaytanat (1<sup>st</sup> book)*. Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensklopediyasi. – 2018. – P. 39.
13. Puzo M. *Godfather*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons. – 1969. – P. 37.