

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 04 Volume: 96

Published: 03.04.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Q.Q. Rayimov
Andijan State University
Basic doctoral student

SYSTEM ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE AND SPEECH PARADIGMS

Abstract: This article discusses and addresses the issue of systematic analysis of language and speech paradigms, which has not been seriously studied so far.

Key words: paradigm, paradigmatic approach, language and speech research.

Language: English

Citation: Rayimov, Q. Q. (2021). System analysis of language and speech paradigms. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (96), 37-41.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-96-8> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.04.96.8>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

UDC: 81'373.22

Uzbek linguistics has passed through the stages of empirical, theoretical knowledge and risen to the meta-theoretical stage. As a result, there was a need to revisit the language and speech phenomena studied at different stages of language development. Because when a certain paradigm fails to reveal one or another feature of language and speech, there is a need for a new paradigm. The new paradigm, on the other hand, works on the basis of new principles, based on the principles of the old paradigm. From this point of view, the current period of Uzbek linguistics can be explained by the emergence of new paradigms, new principles. Today, research in Uzbek linguistics is developing on the basis of new principles. In particular, the anthropological perspective on language is growing. The cognitive approach is relevant in the study of language phenomena. This is due to the fact that the attention within the government within our language has influenced the fact that man is the main factor in the approach to language.

MAIN PART

If we look at the stages of development of Uzbek linguistics, today it has gone through a long period before entering the meta-theoretical stage. In the

period up to the 90s, he took the general methodological aspect, the criterion of description, from the mold of Russian linguistics. Although the methodological description and criterion fell into the general pattern, Russian linguistics became the criterion in terms of conclusions and definitions, based on the general universal state of the language. This in its time prevented an objective conclusion. This is because the Uzbek language and its structural structure, although in accordance with the universal rules of Russian linguistics, differed in specific aspects. After gaining independence, Uzbek linguistics has determined its path of development. In particular, prof. A.Nurmonov¹, N.Mahmudov, A. Hojiev, G'. On the basis of the services of such scientists as Abdurakhonov, H. Nematov, it has risen to a new level. It received its assessment on the basis of fluoristic views. As a result, each language unit has a definition beyond a particular political superstructure. Uzbek linguistics has created its own methodology. It is true that Uzbek linguistics has copied methods and methodology from Russian linguistics for a hundred years, but it has not deviated from its path of development. A.Navoiy, Z.M.Bobur, M. Zamakhshariy, M. Kashgari, A. It developed on the basis of the services of scholars such as Fitrat and set its own path of independent development. As a result, a theory of national linguistics emerged.

¹ Nurmonov A. Selected Works, Volumes I-II-III. T. : Akademiashr, 2015.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Academician A.Xojiev prof. A.Nurmonov, prof. H.Nematov, prof. N.Mahmudov, prof.

National linguistic theories of such scientists as G. Abdurahmanov appeared. In this sense, new perspectives have emerged in the concept of language and speech. An objective assessment of our language began.

The phenomenon of synonymy has different tariffs. However, these definitions do not justify themselves today in terms of certain conclusions. Differences occur, especially at the language and speech stage.

In later periods, there are different views on the relationship between language and speech. In our opinion, it is expedient to classify and interpret language and noun on the basis of paradigms. Because the paradigm is most conducive to mutual conflict

Among the paradigms of language and speech, the synonymous paradigm occupies a special place. Because synonyms have a special place in the realization of speech. In the periods of our linguistics up to the present day, synonyms have been given different definitions, and paradigm elements have been interpreted differently. In the views to date, the main member has been the diversity of form and the uniformity of meaning *. At the present metanotheoretical stage of our linguistics, it is necessary to look at the phenomenon of synonymy differently. While form and content were seen as the primary standard in the phenomenon of synonymy, a pragmatic aspect has also emerged today that has frustrated the standard of form and content. Analyzed from an anthropolinguistic point of view, any content can be onomaseologically equivalent to a particular form. This indicates that the above definition is incomplete. For example, a person working at a research institute is told, "Today there is a scientific-theoretical seminar. Then you have to report. The lecture will start at 16:00 as usual. We would like to inform you that the lecture will be held in a large hall." The speaker said, " I understand that my lecture stayed at home. I will bring my lecture, of course, I will give a lecture at 16:00," he said, which means that the researcher will give a lecture. Both in form and in semantic relation, the above is true. However, on the basis of the contractual relationship between the speaker and the listener, a different content can be understood through the above forms (words). That is, we can understand that the word speaker means speech, sitting, and it is the speaker's turn. "My lecture stayed at home," he said, "My money stayed at home." This is a pragmatic process in a speech situation. To understand the pragmatic content, words such as "scientific research institute", "scientific theoretical seminar", "lecture" in their sense are the basis for the correct formation of the sentence. But its figurative meanings emerge from a pragmatic point of view. It is clear from the above that any form can adapt to different meanings. Hence, the lexical analysis of the

relation of form and meaning requires a certain change in the definition given to the phenomenon of synonymy. Therefore, in our opinion, it is necessary to add a pragmatic member to the definition given to the phenomenon of synonymy. However, the relationship of form and meaning in the definition given to the phenomenon of synonymy remains the main benchmark. Only the definition of the speech process, the style, clarifies the situation. In it, the contractual relationship between the speaker and the listener comes to the fore. For example, words such as dollar, greens, cabbage do not form a synonymous line in terms of literary language. Or words like girl, lanka, danap, pat, teapot, flower also do not form a synonymous line in terms of literary language. However, it is methodologically synonymous within certain groups. It is therefore necessary to add a pragmatic member to the synonymous paradigm. From a sitemic point of view, the boundaries of synonymous words cannot be defined if the basis for the phenomenon of synonymy is the diversity of form, the uniformity of meaning. For example, if the word money is interpreted as a unit of communication in terms of literary language, it can be pragmatically synonymous from the professional point of view of the speaker: money is a book for teachers, mud for builders, puck for drivers, syringe for doctors, bread for novices, ketmon in the eyes of gardeners, seedlings in the eyes of gardeners, sheep or cattle in the eyes of cattle breeders, boots or boots in the eyes of artisans, stitches in the eyes of carpenters, razors in the eyes of hairdressers, pat in the eyes of artists, decisions in the eyes of government officials, cases in the eyes of police . Apparently, the definition of a series of synonyms is pragmatically infinite and limitless. Therefore, in our opinion, the synonymous paradigm needs to be reconsidered.

Only as we become more and more aware of the nature of language and its essence in human life do new questions arise, and the need to re-examine previous questions and their answers grows. "Linguistics is an empirical science in which theoretical ideas are always formed on the basis of the analysis of accumulated evidence. Therefore, the interest of linguists in the study of the basic structural units of language (phoneme, morpheme, word, sentence, etc.) is inevitable. But in order to fully understand the essence of language, in addition to the external phenomena, it is necessary to study the organizational parts of human linguistic activity, the phenomena within it "[3:15].

Nowadays, the semantic and onomasiological study of language units narrows the scope of analysis of linguistic units. The pragmatic analysis of language units is one of the most pressing issues of our modern linguistics. This is because pragmatic analysis provides ample opportunity to analyze unexplored aspects of linguistic units.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

"The pragmatic features of linguistic activity, the study of the factors that give rise to these features, are important in determining the social nature of language. This makes it possible to find evidence that linguistic communication takes place in accordance with social and psychological laws, and at the same time the development of the language system. It can be said that the starting point for the development of the language system begins with pragmatics. This is a phylogenetically and ontologically sound claim "[3:37]. Hence, linguistic analysis should begin with pragmatics.

"The syntax and semantics of linguistic units are lacking for a complete description of these units. Only when pragmatics is added to syntax and semantics do they find their true interpretation. For example: The phrase "enjoying all the time" expresses the proposition of certain individuals and their situation in a particular time and place. However, this alone is not enough to make the proposition expressed by the sentence clear to the speakers. To do this, the speakers need to have a general knowledge of the specific groups and their situation that are enjoying their time, of the specific space and time that is taking place. Because not all people in the world can enjoy their time "[2: 245]. Hence, the above sentence must be related to specific individuals, specific space and time. The study of such a relationship between the proposition expressed by the sentence and the state of speech constitutes the pragmatic side of the sentence.

If it were up to me, I would say that we Uzbeks are a very pragmatic people. Because the possibilities of image and expression of the Uzbek language are so wide, a single syntactic device can be analyzed in several different semantic and pragmatic ways. If the syntactic constructions in the Uzbek language are not understood as "Nimkosa under the cup", "My daughter is talking to you, my daughter-in-law is listening to you", their content will remain kempt. Pragmatic analysis is directly related to the speech context. For example: "Ernesto Valverde's chair also shook as a result of Barcelona's loss of 3 points in a row" (from a football commentary. Diyor Imamkhodjaev). It is well known that coaches whose teams do not show satisfactory results will resign. "Human consciousness is so perfect that it can perceive the associative connections between events" [5:67]. In the example above, the fact that Ernesto Valverde is also on the verge of resignation is "shaken" - it is clear from the syntactic device. However, the presuppositional meaning of this sentence in the plan of expression is understood as Ernesto Valverde injuring a chair intended for some kind of sitting. But pragmatic analysis leads to the

main content of the sentence. That is, it is understood that the coach is on the verge of resigning. It's just a catchphrase in a football commentary. In fact, such a range of meanings of language units is very wide.

"In order to understand information correctly, in addition to the speakers' knowledge of language, it is necessary to add the listener's knowledge of the world, including the knowledge of the social situation used, knowledge of the psyche of the speakers and other knowledge." [2: 244] All of the above knowledge will be equally needed in the process of understanding information. Therefore, only by considering the interrelationship of this knowledge can we come closer to understanding the essence of the speech process.

The pragmatic study of the Uzbek text provides a great opportunity for the researcher to shed light on aspects of linguistic units that have been overlooked in traditional linguistics. The study of syntactic units such as text in this way opens the way to determining their place in the pragmasemantic system.

The phenomenon of synonymy is one of the most studied issues in linguistics². But the current development of our linguistics requires the study of the phenomenon of synonymy not only at the lexical, grammatical level, but also pragmatically. In particular, the study of this phenomenon in the context of language and speech reveals its unique new features. Because the system raises the problem of studying the problem of lexical synonymy from a new perspective, which is described in detail in lexicology and modern semiotics and onomasiology linguistics³. Therefore, there is a need to analyze this phenomenon in the interaction of language and speech, as well as in the interaction (opposition)⁴. In the language stage, the phenomenon of synonymy exists as a specific pattern, forming a commonality with the meaning of nouns and expressions. For example: Synonyms such as aft, bashara, doxt, shixt, yuz, oraz, chehra, jamal form a line of synonyms with the meaning of the name.

If the words in a synonymous row are denoted by S, their number by N, then CNqN. Because the condition of synonymy is that the meaning of the name is the same. No matter how many words there are, they all generalize with the meaning of the noun. This model-pattern reflects lexical synonymy at the language stage. If it reflects the synonymy at the grammatical level, then if we define the grammatical form GrShN instead of the word-S, the synonymous condition of the grammatical form or word form will be the same as the meaning of the expression - the grammatical meaning. Such grammatical synonymy is called GrShNqIgr.m in the language stage. can be represented by a mold-model. The above situation is

² See; Hojev A. Annotated dictionary of synonyms of the Uzbek language. T., 1974, pp. 3-6; Veshl L. M. Sovremennaya lingvisticheskaya semantika. M., 1990, pp. 151-154. Novikov L.A. Semantics of the Russian language. M., 1982, pp. 222-242.

³ Toirova G. Problems in teaching lexical synonyms. Uzbek language and literature.

⁴ See. Rakhimov U. Kosa. half cup at the bottom of the bowl. Andijan. 1995, p.17.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИЦ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

repeated even if the phenomenon of synonymy is within the context of syntactic integrity-words and sentences. Only the synonymous row element remains a phrase or sentence. If we define a phrase as SBN. In that case, the pattern of such synonymy at the linguistic stage is expressed as SBNqNsb. If the element of a synonymous series is a sentence, we define the sentence as G, then the language-level model of such a synonym can be expressed as GNqN. If a synonymous row element is text, it can be represented by a TNqN-style model. Summarizing the above cases, it looks like this:

1. С_{НКН}-лексик синонимия
2. ГрШ_{НКИ}-морфологик синонимия
3. Г_{НКН}-синтактик синонимия
4. СБ_{НКН}-синтактик синонимия
5. Т_{НКН}-матн синонимияси

We have considered the linguistic stage patterns of the phenomenon of synonymy based on the condition that the noun and expression meanings of a word, grammatical form, phrase, sentence, text are equal to each other.

There is a peculiar complexity in the speech-stage manifestations of the considered patterns. Such complexity can even reach infinity. The phenomenon of synonymy forms a synonymous series with the equivalence of expression and pronoun meaning or pragmatic meaning in the speech stage. Synonyms that form a synonymous row with a pragmatic meaning are called pragmatic⁵. The discrepancy between their meanings is related to the speech process.

For example: the word "aft" lexically means "face". But the speech situation, depending on the objective situation, sometimes also represents a superficial meaning. Because in a speech situation, if a child-listener is dirty, the speaker says to him, "Look at your face!" uses the phrase. From an objective point of view, the meaning of the word "aft" is understood by any linguist in the form of an overcoat. That is, in speech, the word "aft" has a specific meaning, combines with the word "dress-head" in a hive and forms a synonym.

Sometimes, based on the speech situation and context, the word "aft" also refers to the worldview, speech, level of knowledge. If the speaker utters thoughts or words that are not acceptable to the audience, the listener will say to him, "Look at his face!" uses the phrase. From the speech situation and the objective situation, we understand the general worldview, not the face of a person, by the word "aft". Many can cite the fact that the occurrence of such a situation is related to the speech situation. The

meaning of the word "AFT" in relation to a particular speech situation is a pragmatic meaning⁶. Therefore, as discussed above, the fact that the meaning of the word "aft" is equally pragmatic, which is equivalent to the meanings expressed by the words "top-down", "worldview", requires an analysis of the specifics of this phenomenon at the speech stage.

It has become a tradition to analyze the features of the phenomenon of synonymy at the lexical level on the basis of four different approaches. Lexical synonymy is explored on the basis of semantic similarity, free exchange in the mutual paradigm, methodological similarity, and contextual-textual connection⁷. Synonyms separated on the basis of logical connection are determined by the similarity of meanings associated with the speech situation in the speech process. Therefore, they can be called synonyms, and in some cases they are also called denotative synonyms, and it is said that they are somewhat limited by linguistic synonymy⁸.

When the phenomenon of synonymy is approached as a category, it becomes clear that it is a linguistic, semantic, pragmatic category. Synonymy as a linguistic category does not interact with pragmatic synonymy. The basics of making them a hive will also vary. Lexical synonymy is defined as a linguistic category and forms a hive with a common noun meaning. Pragmatic synonymy, on the other hand, is a semantic category in which the meanings of words in a speech situation are intertwined. The meanings of words in relation to the speech process are occasional meanings and do not participate in this meaning in any other speech situation. It may even have a meaning that is not the same as the name. The occurrence of such a situation is influenced by the speech process, the speech situation, the non-verbal tone, the gesture, the contractual relationship between the speaker and the listener. For example: the word balance is lexically a calm, stable state of bodies under the influence of equal forces in opposite directions; the equilibrium of opposing forces, the relative stagnation caused by the harmonization, represents the tranquility³. This word can form a synonymous nest with the word "relationship" in a particular speech situation: The relationship between natural phenomena — the balance between natural phenomena.

Sometimes it is synonymous on the basis of interdependence. It is therefore relevant today to generalize all of them under the name of a common name-pragmatic synonym, to reveal the peculiarities or distinguishing features of the microsystems within it.

⁵ See. A.Nurmonov et al. Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language (morphology) T., 2001. Pages 8-10.

⁶ Rahimov U. Presupposition of downloads in Uzbek language. ND. Samarkand, 1994. p.64.

⁷ Novikov L.A. Semantics of the Russian language M., 1982, pp. 222-223.

⁸ Novikov L.A. Semantics of the Russian language M., 1982, pp. 224.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIHII (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 9.035	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Contextual, denotative, occult, presuppositional synonyms emphasized in the literature differ from lexical synonyms. They form a hive with speech-pragmatic meanings, not with noun meanings.

Pragmatic synonymy is a macrosystem that is in opposition to lexical synonymy and is defined on the basis of this contradiction. Microsystems formed by synonyms defined on the basis of lexical categories become an element of the lexical synonymy macrosystem. Synonyms defined by pragmatic categories: occasional, contextual, presuppositional synonyms form an microsystem and become an element of the macrosystem of pragmatic synonymy.

The relationships between the elements that make up a synonymous macrosystem vary, and they have a separate article scope. So we didn't dwell on them.

Conclusion

In short, the onomosiological analysis of the phenomenon of synonymy reveals its peculiar new aspects. This has a special place in the study of other linguistic units related to the phenomenon of synonymy. Especially hermeneutics in literature is of special importance as one of the members that reveals the essence of scientific research in the pragmatic direction of linguistics.

References:

1. Nurmonov, A., et al. (2001). *Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language (morphology)*. (pp.8-10). Tashkent.
2. Rahimov, U. (1994). *Presupposition of downloads in Uzbek language*. ND. (p.64). Samarkand.
3. Novikov, L.A. (1982). *Semantics of the Russian language*. (pp.222-223). Moscow.
4. Hojev, A. (1974). *Annotated dictionary of synonyms of the Uzbek language*. (pp.3-6). Tashkent.
5. (1981). *Annotated dictionary of the Uzbek language*. 1 tom. (p.475). Moscow.
6. Eshmuminov, A. (n.d.). Problems of creating national corpus of the uzbek language (level of synonyms). *Theoritically applied sciense*, 5 (73), 47-50.
7. Eshmuminov, A. (2019). Norms of creating a synonymous base of the national corpus of the Uzbek language. *Word art, Journal of Word Art* #3, 29-33.
8. Veshl, L. M. (1990). *Sovremennaya lingvisticheskaya semantika*. (pp.151-154). Moscow.
9. Novikov, L.A. (1982). *Semantics of the Russian language*. (pp.222-242). Moscow.
10. Toirova, G. (2010). Problems in teaching lexical synonyms. *Uzbek language and literature*, №6, 22-25.