Saida Akhmedjanovna Nazarova
Bukhara State University
Associate Professor, Department
of Uzbek Linguistics,
nazarova0710@mail.ru

OCCURRENCE OF PARADIGMATIC RELATIONSHIP IN OBJECTIVE ASSOCIATIONS

Abstract: *The paradigmatic relation in the linguistic construction of the Uzbek vocabulary, as an example of the linguistic construction patterns of object compounds are explored in this article, and used the substance analysis method to identify the paradigms of these words.*

Key words: *word combinations, object combinations, substitution linguistics, linguistic syntactic templates, paradigmatic relations, paradigm.*

Language: *English*

Citation: Nazarova, S. A. (2019). Occurrence of paradigmatic relationship in objective associations. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 11 (79), 474-477.*

Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-79-98   *Doi*: crossref https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.11.79.98

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

As a source of study of the Uzbek language, which is a symbol of our national values and pride, our science, like all other spheres of our life, has gone through the independent path of development and reached a high level of scientific worldview. Our national linguistics, which preserves and preserves the history of Uzbek culture and social consciousness, combines national linguistic and self-linguistic capacities in its essence and strives to make it a world language. Naturally, as a result of these aspirations, many aspects of Uzbek linguistics have emerged. There is a divergence in the science of language construction, language units, and Uzbek grammar in general, as a result of serious efforts to make the language more realistic and clear. As a result of such serious efforts, it is worth mentioning the sub-standard linguistics that has made a revolution in 21st century Uzbek linguistics.

Literature review:

As a result of systematic study of the Uzbek language construction and methodological combination of gnoseological bases of dialectical logic, the direction of formal-functional analysis, formed in our science at the end of the 20th century,

was described by Professor N. Nematov: "S. N. Ivanov founded in the 1960s. The main principle is to develop structured analysis on the basis of conscious, dialectical, methodological principles, as a treasure of possibilities that can shape and develop language, occur in thousands of shapes and forms of speech, each form has its own goals and objectives to the development of Uzbek Sub-Linguistics". Formal functional functional research methods, now known as "Uzbek Sub-linguistics," and the well-known linguistic doctrine has revealed the general linguistic essence of the language of all levels of the Uzbek language as opposed to linguistic The theoretical foundations of the role of systems in the system. Therefore, it is not possible to conclude that the sub-interpretation of the Uzbek language has ended, as all scientific problems facing the Uzbek Sub-Linguistics have been resolved, and the results of Substance Studies have been published and put into practice. This is because the Uzbek elemental linguistics has a "gap" in the sub-interpretation of a system of word combinations that is as important as the syntactic units. It is also a subversive analysis of the Uzbek vocabulary. Hierarchical characteristic of the linguistic syntactic system of vocabulary syntactic constructions, which in the Uzbek language must be

included in the list of linguistic syntactic construction patterns. Only the existing gaps can be filled by addressing issues such as the study of hyperonic, paradigmatic relationships, and the paradigm of syntactic linguistic syntactic constructions. Consequently, the substitution study of the Uzbek language has not been completed, and the problem of substitution analysis of the system of words is waiting for its solution. Microstructure of linguistic units within the system also implies that the linguistic syntactic constructions of the word are also studied as a linguistic syntactic microstructure. This, in turn, necessitates the systematic study of the linguistic syntactic structure of each word combination, as well as the linguistic syntactic construction of object combinations. Therefore, paradigmatic analysis of the linguistic syntactic structure of object compounds in the Uzbek language and establishing the paradigm of the construction patterns of these words is one of the pressing issues on the agenda of sub-studies. As a systematic study of language, the buds are, in fact, linked to the separation of language levels. At the same time, the linguistic relationship also occurs between the parts of the system integrity, that is, the linguistic layers and the linguistic units. They can be further divided into:

1. relationship of one-level units;
2. relationship of different levels of units, i.e. inter-layer relations;

It should be noted that the notion of interaction in system analysis is very important. As in any system, the essence of each unit in the language system is determined not by the unit itself, but by the relationship between the units of that system.

As you know, there are basically three types of relations between linguistic units:

1. Similarity (paradigmatic) relationship;
2. Sequential (hierarchical) relationship;
3. Neighborhood (syntagmatic) relationship.

This classification of relations between the linguistic units is reflected in the manual of the Uzbek system lexicology. In contrast, A. Nurmanov and S. Shahobiddinov have shown that the subdivisions have two interrelated relationships, which are homogeneous (paradigmatic) and sequential (syntagmatic) relations. Linguistic relationships are of three types - paradigmatic (similarity, homogeneity), hierarchical, and syntagmatic (neighborhood, consecutive), regardless of whether they are between units of the same level or between different levels of units sequence). The founder of the system linguistics - F.de Saussure called the association of language units with the term "associative relationship", taking into account their mental state. Subsequently, great attention was paid to the interactions of language units and was referred to as the term "paradigmatic approach." According to de Saussure, speech-free language units have different systemic relationships in the memory of a person, and this is called a paradigmatic link between the system organizers. Many language units are stored in the language memory in a discrete (systematic) and systematic manner, so that they can be used quickly and easily in speech. The fact that a large number of language units are discrete in the memory of a person is usually based on their mutual opposites. Linguistic units have the ability to remind each other. Therefore, they live in the consciousness of the members of the community. At the same time, the units that resemble each other have something in common. The similarity and commonality are the signs that hold them together in a system. The system of linguistic units, which are united by each other and which are mutually exclusive, but which contradict each other with its own sign, are called paradigms. The unit that forms the paradigm is called a member of the paradigm. The textbook "Fundamentals of Uzbek language system lexicology" also describes the description: "The essence of similarity relationships is that language units with similarities and differences are combined." H. Nematov and O. Bazarov explain in the book Language and Speech: "Two or more language units opposed to certain similarities and differences" are mutually opposed. Accordingly, two or more opposing language units form a paradigm line. Of course, in order for two or more linguistic units to be combined into a paradigmatic series, there must be substitutionary and meaningful similarities, differences, and differences between them. Determination of the similarities and differences in the construction of object combinations, that is, the meaning of [object-activity] in Uzbek, allows us to determine the paradigm of these compounds. Therefore, we examine the paradigmatic relationship between the forms of object associations. Words that express the meaning of the [object] in the form of revenue, direction, time, output, $[Ik \sim F] = WC$ in the form of summarizing the subordinate in the general linguistic form $[I^{k.k.}]$ is reflected. At the same time, the general form $[F]$ represents the meaning of the [action] meaning of this syntactic form in the position of the governor. Of this member [I k. k.] proprietary forms belonging to the common form give different series of similarities on the basis of agreement types and indicators. For example, along with the similarity that defines the general form of [I k.k.], the glossary of the subordinate member's terms is formed by the rate of return:

1.0 $[I^{t.k.} \sim F] = WC.$
1.1. $[O^{t.k.} \sim F] = WC.$
1.2. $[Sf^{t.k.} \sim F] = WC.$
1.3. $[S^{t.k.} \sim F] = WC.$
1.4. $[T^{t.k.} \sim F] = WC.$
1.5. $[Olm^{t.k.} \sim F] = WC.$
1.6. $[Sd^{t.k.} \sim F] = WC.$
1.7. $[Hn^{t.k.} \sim F] = WC.$

In this analogy, the templates based on the "1.1-1.7" sequence remind each other of the formation and

meaning of the object. It is worth noting that these two features share their commonalities and unite them as members of a series. This shows that there is a paradigmatic relationship between the templates in "1.1-1.7." Hence, the templates placed in the "1.1-1.7" sequence are a syntactic paradigm. While the members of this syntactic paradigm are similar, in fact, one of them is a contradiction. This is because the conflict between template 1.1 [Ot.k.~F]=WC and type 1.2 [Sft.k.~F]=WC, the second is based on the lexical-semantic sign associated with the quality. The distinctive character of these molds is also reflected in the specifics of their meaning.

For example, [Ot.k.~F]=WC means that the product of the movement passes to the object represented by the proceeds of revenue, whereas [Sf t.k.~F]=WC derivative means that the movement is transferred to the object represented by the proceeds. It is found that [O t.k.~F]=WC and [Sf t.k.~F]=WC are in conflict with the lexical-semantic properties of the dictionary terms. This indicates that these units are in conflict within the paradigm. In turn, the question arises whether other members of the paradigm, in particular, Forms 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7, are similarly opposed to each other. Naturally, the answer to this question requires that every member of the paradigm be able to view each other in conflict with the opposing units, or other members. This means that there is a repetition of the existing conflicts between the [O$^{t.k.}$~F]=WC and [Sf$^{t.k.}$~F]=WC templates above. In other words, there is an inconsistent contradiction between the formulas of the object in the revenue agreement, and the proprietary expressions of the meaning of the words on the basis of their lexical-semantic signs. Only the lexical-semantic features of members of comparable templates confirm that this conflict occurs in different forms. Specifically, the conflict between Form 1.3 and Form 1.4 represents the lexical-semantic quantities of the [S$^{t.k.}$~F]=WC template, and the [T$^{t.k.}$~F]=WC mold lexical-semantic. The appearance is based on the contrast between the image and the outline. In the first type of results, the movement is transferred to a quantitative object, and in the second, to a pictorial object, and the difference between them is due to the conflict in the linguistic syntactic construction. Therefore, such contradictions exist between members of the paradigm that define [I$^{t.k.}$~ F]=WC, indicating the paradigmatic link between these syntactic forms.

Conclusion:

Therefore, in the construction of object combinations, the similarity of the sequence "1.1-1.7" which defines the linguistic form of [I$^{t.k.}$~F]=WC and emerges from the basis of a common-private dialect, is a syntactic paradigm. At the same time, [object-movement] is a paradigm in the vocabulary system that forms only the lexical-semantic features of the word in terms of the yield agreement. Hence, this paradigm is an internal paradigm that connects the general linguistic form of [It.k.~F]=WC and [Ik.k.~F]=WC forms a network of paradigms as one of such internal paradigms.

References:

1. Nematov, H. (2009). On formal, structural and substitution directions in Uzbek linguistics" *Uzbek language and literature. - Tashkent,. N4*, pp.35-41.
2. Negmatov, H., & Bozorov, O. (1993). *"Language and Speech"*. (p.32). Tashkent: Teacher.
3. Nematov, H., & Rasulov, R. (1995). "*Fundamentals of system lexicology of the Uzbek language*". (p.128). Tashkent: Instructor.
4. Nurmonov, A., Shahobiddinova, Sh., Iskandarova, Sh., & Nabieva, D. (2001). *"Theoretical Grammar of the Uzbek Language. Morphology"*. (p.164). Tashkent: East.
5. Sayfullaeva, R., Mengliyev, B., Bogieva, G., Kurbanova, M., Yunusova, Z., & Abuzalova, M. (2009). "*Modern Uzbek Literary Language*". (p.414).Tashkent: Science and Technology.
6. Sharipov, M. (1978). *The problem of syntax of the phrase in modern Uzbek language*. (p.88). Tashkent: Science.
7. Kurbanova, M. (2001). *Interpretation of formal-functional orientation and simple sentence formation in Uzbek linguistics*: Philol. doctor of sciences ... dissert ... autorf. (p.51). Tashkent.
8. Gulomov, A., & Askarova, M. (1987). *Modern Uzbek Literary Language.* Syntax. (p.256). Tashkent: Instructor.
9. Kurbanova, M., Nematov, H., & Sayfullaeva, R. (1999). *Fundamentals of the structural syntax of the Uzbek language.* (p.55). Tashkent: University.
10. Nazarova, S. (2002). Problems of formal-functional analysis of word combinations. *Uzbek language and literature. Tashkent, №6*, pp.55-57.

Clarivate
Analytics indexed

11. Abdurakhmanov, G., Suleymanov, A., Kholiyorov, H., & Amanturdiev, J. (1979). Modern Uzbek literary language. Syntax. (p.208). Tashkent: Instructor.

12. (1976). Grammar of the Uzbek language. Volume II. (p.560). Tashkent: Science.

13. Nazarova, S. (2008). On the principles of syntactic construction of linguistics. *Scientific information of Bukhara State University, Bukhara, #3*, pp.66-68.