SEMANTIC AND LEXICAL PARADIGMATIC RELATIONS

Razaqova Sevinch
Female student of English language and literature faculty,
Igamberdieva Shahnoza
teacher of English language and literature faculty
Fergana State University

Annotation: This article is devoted to the study of various linguistic points of view on paradigmatic relations, especially semantic and lexical paradigmatic relations, their essential features. A number of definitions are given and compared. In addition, the general and special features of semantic and lexical-paradigmatic relations, a deep look at the concept of relations, which were proposed by outstanding linguists, are given. The results of this article can help readers form a general linguistic understanding of paradigmatic relations.

Key words: relation, paradigmatic relation, semantic relation, lexical relation, antonym, synonym, meronym, contrast.

Although paradigmatic semantic relations have been defined in logical terms, such definitions say little about the role of semantic relations in lexical memory and language use. Thus, pragmatic and psycholinguistic perspectives are related to the relationship between competence and productivity. The study of these relationships involves determining what we need to know in order to know how to do something (for example, to produce or interpret a meaningful statement), and what we know as a result of having done it. All of the above types of knowledge do not necessarily imply awareness of the relevant concepts or processes. Awareness is the least interesting type of knowledge for our current purposes, since it is not so much about what we know, as about what we know, what we know (and knowledge about knowledge is the problem of epistemologists, not linguists). If we realize that night is the opposite of day, it is because the conscious mind has some access to what is happening in the subconscious. Knowing that two words are antonyms or synonyms can include any of the subconscious types of knowledge. If such relationships are fixed in the mind, then we either know them because we were innately programmed for this knowledge, or because we learned that two words are connected and added this information to our mental representations of these words. We can exclude the innate representation of lexical relations, since knowledge is specific to the language. Hot and cold cannot be initially programmed as antonyms, since this fact is relevant only to native English speakers. Having an innate mental representation of each relationship for each possible language is clearly impossible, since there are an infinite number of possible languages. So far, the research topic has been described as paradigmatic semantic relations between words. In the literature, these relations are usually called lexical relations or semantic relations, and sometimes these two terms are used in contrast. Saussure was interested exclusively in three types of systemic relations: the relationship between the signifier and the signified, the relationship between the sign and all other elements of his system, and the relationship between the sign and the elements that surround it in a particular signifying instance. He emphasized that meaning arises from differences between signifiers; these differences are of two types: syntagmatic (concerning positioning) and paradigmatic (concerning substitution). Saussure called the latter associative relations, but now the term of Roman Jacobson is used. The common element, the relation, is rather vague, but in its most basic usage it describes joint membership in a defined set. For example, sky and high are connected by the fact that they are part of a set of English words that rhyme with eye. The relation is also used to distinguish the types of definition criteria that define such a set: so, the relation between the sky, height and eye is a rhyme relation (i.e. the criterion of

belonging to a relational set is the similarity of the final sounds of a word). For our purposes, a relation can mean a paradigmatic relation in which a set of words forms a kind of paradigm, such as a semantic paradigm, which contains members of the same grammatical category that share some semantic characteristics but do not share others. For example, a set of basic color terms forms a paradigm whose members are adjectives (or nouns), each of which refers to a different part of the color spectrum. Of course, not all paradigms are defined semantically. Inflectional paradigms, for example, include possible variations of a lexical element in some inflectional category, such as a number. Thus, there is a morphological paradigmatic connection between the child and the child elements. Paradigmatically related words are to some extent grammatically interchangeable with each other. For example, blue, black and any other member of the color paradigm can be intelligently and grammatically used in the phrase "chair". Thus, paradigmatic relations differ from syntagmatic relations, which are relations between words that are combined into a syntactic structure. For example, we can talk about the syntagmatic connection between eat and dinner. These two types of relations are not always easy to distinguish, although a (controversial) rule of thumb for distinguishing them is that paradigmatic relations exist between members of the same grammatical category, while syntagmatic relations include members of different grammatical categories. For the present purposes, it makes sense to use the term "semantic relations" to refer to relations defined by semantic paradigms, but not before making some reservations. Semantic relations are sometimes used to refer to phrasal or sentential relations, such as paraphrase, attraction and contradiction, but here it should be understood as "paradigmatic semantic relations between words". Considering the pragmatic perspective taken here and the fact that non-semantic factors can influence these so-called semantic relations, it can be argued that they should be called pragmatic relations. Paradigmatic relations can operate at the level of the signifier, the signified, or both. A paradigm is a set of associated signifiers that 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. Paradigmatic relations are those that belong to the same set by virtue of a common function for them... The sign enters into a paradigmatic relationship with all signs , which can also occur in the same context , but not at the same time . In this context, one element of the paradigm set is structurally replaced by another. Signs are in a paradigmatic relationship , when the choice of one excludes the choice of the other . The use of one signifier (for example, a certain word or item of clothing) instead of another from the same set of paradigms (for example, adjectives or hats, respectively) forms the preferred meaning of the text. Non-semantic factors can influence judgments about how well a set of, say, synonymous words illustrates a synonymous connection, but the meanings of words create or destroy this connection. The term "lexical relation" is used here to refer to any paradigmatic relationship between words, not just a semantic relationship. So, lexical relationships include phonetic relationships (such as rhyme or alliteration), morphological relationships (such as inflectional variation), and morphosyntactic relationships (such as joint membership in a grammatical category). Again, it is appropriate to make a reservation. The term "lexical relation" is ambiguous in the sense that it can refer to the relationship between words (on the page, in the mind, or wherever they exist) or to the relationship (between lexical elements) within the mental lexicon. For some authors, these two meanings are interchangeable, since they adhere to (or assume) that if words are related, then this relationship is represented in the lexicon. They distinguish between pairs of antonyms, such as big/small, and other semantically opposite pairs, such as giant/tiny, arguing that the former are lexical antonyms (i.e. intra-lexically related), as well as conceptual opposites (semantically related), while the latter are opposed only conceptually. For them, this means that the contrast between big and small should be represented in the mental lexicon, but the

relationship between giant and tiny is not part of the representation of these words in the lexicon. In the context of the term "lexical relations" in this book, one should only assume that "lexical" means "involving words", and not "contained in the mental lexicon". The term "intra-lexical" indicates that the structure or fragment of lexical information is contained within the lexicon. Metal-lexical indicates information that is not contained in the lexicon, even if it may be information about words. The basic relationships discussed here are illustrated as follows: synonymy: sofa=couch=divan=davenport; antonymy: good/bad, life/death, come/go; contrast: sweet/sour/bitter/salty, solid/liquid/gaseous; hyponymy, or inclusion in the class: cat<mammal<stanza<poem. The equal sign (=) is used to indicate synonymy. A slash (/) between members of antonymic or contrasting sets means semantic incompatibility of contrasting words. Antonymy is a subtype of contrast in the sense that it is a contrast within a binary paradigm. Although the term antonymy is sometimes used to denote more specific relationships, here it is used to denote any binary semantic contrast between lexical units (whereas the opposite is used more widely here, not limited to the contrast between linguistic expressions). The sign "less than" () is like a poem >stanza (i.e. "a poem is a holonym of a stanza"). For example, a cat does not have the same relationship to a mammal (catcat). In one direction, it is the relationship between a category and its highest category, and in the other, it is the relationship between a category and its subordinate. On the other hand, synonymy, antonymy and contrast are non-hierarchical relations and are usually characterized as symmetrical relations in the sense that the relationship between, say, a couch and a sofa is indistinguishable from the relationship between a sofa and a couch-couch. Thus, we can say that a couch and a sofa are synonymous with each other, but we cannot say that a cat and a mammal are hyponyms of each other. A cat is a hyponym of a mammal, and a mammal is a hyperonym of a cat. Similarly, a meronym is a unidirectional term, so a stanza is a meronym of a poem, but a poem is a holonym of a stanza. A complete theory of semantic relations should take into account the continuum of relationships, which is revealed by the judgments of language users about the "best" and "worst" examples of these relations. Defining antonymy as a referential incompatibility would mean that hot, boiling, steaming, warm, scalding and many other words would be equally appropriate as cold antonyms in any context, since all these words describe states incompatible with cold. So we need to pay special attention to how words or their meanings are connected, not just how things in the world are connected.

Summing up, we can say that words in paradigmatic relations belong to the same class of words and have some common characteristics. Some cases of semantic connection can also be lexical relationships in which not only meanings are connected, but also other aspects of lexemes, such as morphological form or word-combination patterns. Lexical semantics specialists study paradigmatic relationships because of their role in the logical relationships between sentence meanings, such as attraction, and because they can tell us how the mental lexicon is organized. They are also interesting because they are used to create a coherent discourse. The use of related words allows us to describe the same things in different ways, thereby providing a variety of information and avoiding repetition in discourse.

References:
1. Harris R. Reading Saussure: A Critical Commentary on the 'Cours de linguistique gйнйrale'. – London: Duckworth, 1987.
2. Langholz L. V. Hidden Myth: Structure and Symbolism in Advertising. New York: Basic Books, 1975.
3. Lyons J. Semantics, Vol. 1. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
4. Murphy M.L. Lexical meaning. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

5. Saussure F. de. Course in General Linguistics (trans. Roy Harris). – London: Duckworth, 1983.

6. Silverman D., Torode B. The Material Word: Some Theories of Language and its Limits. – London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.

7. Silverman K. The Subject of Semiotics. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.