THE STUDY OF THE SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF PARADIGMS

Orzibekov Fazilbek Ulugbekovich

Independent Researcher at Kimyo International University in Tashkent

Annotatsiya

Maqolada paradigmalarning ma'no tuzilishi tadqiqi haqida ma'lumotlar berilgan. Sintaktik paradigma tilshunoslikda nafaqat shakliy va tarkibiy birliklar majmuasi, balki ularning ortida turgan semantik konsepsiyalar tizimi sifatida ham e'tirof etiladi. Paradigmalarni mazmuniy qurulma sifatida o'rganish degani – bu ularning shakliy o'xshashligidan tashqari, biror umumiy ma'no yadrosi atrofida shakllangan variantlar tizimi sifatida tahlil qilinishi ilmiy asoslangan. Kognitiv yondashuv, funktsional-sistemaviy grammatika, diskurs tahlili, mazmuniy grammatika kabi yo'nalishlar keng rivojlanayotgani haqida ma'lumot berilgan.

Kalit so'zlar

Sintaktik paradigma, mazmuniy qurulma, nutqiy faoliyat, mazmuniy grammatika, kognitiv lingvistika, nevropsixologiya, sotsiokognitiv yondashuv.

Аннотация

В статье приводятся сведения об изучении семантической структуры парадигм. Синтаксическая парадигма осознается в лингвистике не только как совокупность формально-структурных единиц, но и как система стоящих за ними семантических понятий. Изучение парадигм как семантической структуры означает, что, помимо их формального сходства, научно обоснованным является их анализ как системы вариантов, сформированных вокруг общего смыслового ядра. Приводятся сведения о широком развитии таких направлений, как когнитивный подход, функционально-системная грамматика, дискурсивный анализ, семантическая грамматика.

Ключевые слова

Синтаксическая парадигма, семантическая структура, речевая деятельность, семантическая грамматика, когнитивная лингвистика, нейропсихология, социокогнитивный подход.

Annotation

The article provides information on the study of the semantic structure of paradigms. A syntactic paradigm is recognized in linguistics not only as a set of formal and structural units, but also as a system of semantic concepts behind them.

The study of paradigms as a semantic structure means that, in addition to their formal similarity, it is scientifically justified to analyze them as a system of variants formed around a common core of meaning. Information is provided on the widespread development of such areas as the cognitive approach, functional-systemic grammar, discourse analysis, and semantic grammar.

Keywords

Syntactic paradigm, semantic structure, speech activity, semantic grammar, cognitive linguistics, neuropsychology, sociocognitive approach.

The syntactic paradigm in linguistics is recognized not only as a set of formal and structural units but also as a system of semantic concepts underlying them. Studying paradigms as a semantic structure means analyzing them not only in terms of their formal similarities but also as a system of variations formed around a common semantic core. This approach has been developed within the frameworks of semantic linguistics, cognitive linguistics, and functional grammar theories and serves to interpret paradigms through their internal semantic layers. The well-known scholar Y. Tojiyev expressed this idea as follows: "…in linguistics, it is impossible to focus solely on either meaning or form. Whichever aspect receives more attention, it leads to one-sidedness and a serious error. Meaning cannot be separated from form" [Y. Tojiyev, 2005: 50]. This idea represents a deep, balanced, and integrative perspective on the theoretical and methodological foundations of linguistics. It reminds us of the necessity of ensuring proportionality between formalism and semanticism when studying linguistic phenomena. The central idea of Y. Tojiyev's view is the inseparability of meaning and form, their interconnection, and mutual determinacy. This perspective is grounded in many traditional linguistic approaches. F. de Saussure considered linguistic units as signs between meaning (signifié) and form (signifiant), while A.V. Bondarko proposed the concept of a form-semantic complex.

Modern cognitive linguistics also interprets language as a knowledge model organized through the alignment of form and meaning. Therefore, if meaning and form are separated, the full nature of a linguistic phenomenon is disrupted, and the likelihood of misinterpretation increases. Y. Tojiyev rightly emphasizes that disrupting the balance between these two approaches leads to "one-sidedness" and "serious errors." For example, when analyzing syntactic form, if the semantic meaning is not taken into account, the analysis becomes one-sided. Conversely, if grammatical tools and structural forms are not considered in semantic analysis, it leads to uncertainties in meaning.

In contemporary linguistics, the principle of form + meaning = unity is foundational, with cognitive approaches, functional-systemic grammar, discourse analysis, and semantic grammar among the key developing fields. Y. Tojiyev's views align with the theoretical roots of these modern approaches. As a theoretical principle that defends against one-sided approaches and promotes balance, it holds great significance. It encourages the linguist to:

1. Study linguistic units integratively, meaning in the unity of form and meaning.

2. Create methodological harmony between syntactic analysis and semantic interpretation.

3. Provide a basis for interpreting language as a living, complex, functional system.

Thus, this idea is scientifically grounded, theoretically profound, and serves as a guiding principle for necessary practical research directions.

Cognitive linguistics, based on the theory of knowledge, considers the human factor as its main cornerstone, since any information about reality finds its expression in the brain and consciousness. The central component of the concept of pragmalinguistics is also the human factor. For this reason, cognitive linguistics is directly concerned with the study of pragmalinguistic factors and their issues. According to Sh. Safarov, when discussing cognitive activity, it is necessary not only to imagine the phenomena of intellect and thinking but also to take into account the products of cognitive activity and all types of mental phenomena related to this activity[Sh. Safarov, 2006: 10]. Sh. Safarov's consideration of cognitive activity is focused on revealing the complex, multilayered, and multi-factor nature of the cognitive process, and it aligns with the approaches within modern cognitive linguistics and psychology.

In our view, Sh. Safarov's reflections on the process of cognition and the concept of thinking are quite close to the truth. The process of cognition is not only related to thinking but also to the product of thinking (i.e., its result) and mental phenomena. This perspective, in contrast to the classical rationalistic approach (which holds that cognition is only possible within the realm of consciousness and thought), reflects a broader and integrative interpretation.

For example: The product of thinking includes knowledge, concepts, thoughts, mental models, concepts, etc.

Mental phenomena can be affective (emotional), irrational (non-rational), social, cultural, or even intuitive experiences.

Here, cognition is interpreted not only as the "working of the mind," but as an activity that encompasses perception, experience, feelings, and imaginations at all levels of human consciousness.

The most important aspect of Sh. Safarov's idea, as referenced, fully aligns with the cognitive sciences—particularly cognitive linguistics, neuropsychology, and sociocognitive approaches. In linguistics, this approach is crucial from the perspective of the theory of conceptual metaphors, cognitive categories, and the interconnection between language and thinking. This is because language encodes not only thinking but also the products of thinking and mental experiences.

In the process of cognition, semantic fields, linguocognitive structures, and discourse classifications also play an active role. Sh. Safarov's reflection on cognitive activity should be highly valued for its psychological clarity and linguistic adaptability. Not limiting cognition solely to intellect or thinking, but understanding it as a complex, multifaceted process, is one of the main requirements of modern theories of knowledge. Therefore, this idea is theoretically grounded, scientifically relevant, and possesses broad methodological possibilities.

The grouping of linguistic units into specific groups based on certain common features is known as a paradigm. The members of a paradigm share a common feature, but each also possesses distinct individual characteristics. These distinguishing features allow for the opposition and coexistence of paradigm members as distinct linguistic units within the language system. This demonstrates that paradigm members, united under a common feature, consist of a set of distinguishing features. Thus, each paradigm member has a specific structure[Sh. Iskandorova, 1998: 11]. The most important feature of a paradigm is the simultaneous existence of generality and distinction. In linguistics, a paradigm refers to the grouping of systemic units based on a common semantic or formal feature. At the same time, each unit maintains its individual function and distinguishing features within the language system.

This concept directly relies on F. de Saussure's view that language is structured based on syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships. It is important to emphasize that Sh. Iskandorova presents the paradigm as a complex structure based on the principles of balance and contradiction, unity and difference, generality and specificity within the language system.

Syntactic paradigms are always directed towards expressing a certain semantic intention or an entity in the mind. Therefore, despite their formal variability, semantic stability is preserved. This necessitates analyzing paradigms using criteria such as semantic equivalence in language, informational prioritization, and communicative adaptability. For example, sentences like "He is

coming," "Coming is he," and "He, is coming?" may differ structurally, but their core meaning (the continuity of the action) remains the same. This constitutes the semantic foundation of syntactic paradigms.

In our view, modern semantic approaches, particularly theories such as frame semantics, conceptual semantics, and prototype theory, directly link linguistic units, including syntactic units, with meaning structures, conceptual domains, and speech activity. Paradigms are seen as syntactic forms of expression for these conceptual domains. Each syntactic paradigm encompasses a specific semantic field—such as action, state, time, cause-effect, assumption, volition, desire, and evaluation—and reflects this core meaning through various syntactic tools.

A speaker never creates a sememe. The speech meaning, however, arises in a specific speech process in accordance with the syntactic context, speech conditions, and the speaker's communicative intention [Sh. Kh. Bobojonov, 2004: 10]. This idea of Sh. Kh. Bobojonov aligns with the main theoretical principles of semantic linguistics, particularly F. de Saussure's view: language (langue) is a general system; speech (parole) is an individual application. A.V. Bondarko described the sememe as a component of a semantic paradigm, while speech meaning arises within the text framework, as emphasized by Charles Morris, Ch. Fillmore, and J. Lakoff, who all stressed that meaning in speech only emerges within the context of the text.

Sh. Kh. Bobojonov's assertion that "a speaker does not create a sememe" should be understood as follows: the speaker does not create new lexical units (new sememes) but selects from existing units and uses them in accordance with the speech context. In this way, the meaning of the sememe is "actualized" in a specific communicative situation, that is, it is brought to life based on the text's context.

The lexical units of language (sememes) are not created arbitrarily by the speaker but are chosen from the existing system. The speech meaning always depends on the context of the text, the syntactic framework, the communicative intention, and the pragmatic situation in which it arises.

Based on this, it can be stated that the semantic analysis of a syntactic paradigm is not concerned with its form but with determining the reasons for its emergence, its semantic direction, and its communicative semantic function. Through this analytical method, it becomes possible to identify the closely related semantic fields expressed in language, how they are linked to the structure, and how the speech situation is variable.

Thus, a paradigm is a linguistic unit that encompasses several syntactic constructions, which through these constructions, represent a stable semantic concept. These units may have structural variations, but they are unified at the core

of meaning. The semantic study of syntactic paradigms allows for a deeper understanding of the relationship between form and meaning, providing insight into the continuity between grammar and semantics. The following sections will analyze the types and levels of these paradigmatic meanings and their expression in the language system.

O.I. Moskalskaya defines syntactic derivation as the complexity of a sentence's semantic form (resulting from the inclusion of an element carrying additional meaning into its composition) [O.I. Moskalskaya, 1981: 126]. This view can be supported, as syntactic paradigms are not only a system of formal substitutions but also a semantic union based on the internal structure of meaning. This internal structure can be divided into layers: the primary meaning (the main idea or concept), semantic peripheries (additional or situationally dependent meaning elements), and the gradational semantic content (meanings transitioning from primary to secondary, including connotative and stylistic levels of meaning). These layers, interconnected, provide each syntactic paradigm with a deep, semantically layered structure.

REFERENCES:

1.   Тожиев Ё. Ўзбек тилида гап ва гап бўлакларининг мақоми масаласига доир. // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. – Тошкент, 2005. – №4. – Б.50.

2.   Safarov Sh. Kognitiv tilshunoslik. – Jizzax, 2006, – 92 b.

3.   Искандарова Ш. Лексикани мазмуний майдон асосида ўрганиш муаммолари. – Тошкент: «Фан» нашриёти, 1998. – 52 б.

4.   Ш.Х.Бобожонов Семема, унинг нутқий воқеланиши ва изоҳли луғатдаги талқини. Филол. фан. ном. …диссертацияси автореферати. – Самарқанд. 2004. – 46 b.

5.   Москальская О.И. Проблемы системного описания синтаксиса. – М., 1981. – С. 126.