

# RELATIONSHIP OF MORPHOLOGICAL PARADIGMS AND FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC FIELD

**Aslanova Ozoda Ibrahimovna**

Senior lecturer at Navoi State University of Mining and Technology

**Abstract:** The article develops morphological paradigms and functional-semantic field relationships, and paradigms, paradigmatics reflect the natural processes that occur and can occur in the human mind and thinking, simple and complex movements of a range of imaginations and generalizations in various forms.

**Key words:** paradigm, functional-semantic field, attitude, views, system

Under the concept of paradigm, classical linguistics refers to the system of word changes of a lexical unit (noun or verb) in a closed tone, marking the patterns of these changes. The Danish linguist L.Elmslev, the founder of Copenhagen glossematics, began to use the concept of paradigm, paradigmatics in the sense of a group (class) in the linguistic system, which broadened the horizons of linguistics. the discovery of the law of stable formation of units in the "clear points of language consciousness" now opened the way to new generalizations within the framework of the paradigm, called for defining legal associative relations. Paradigm members) are not a group of events that have the same meaning and function, and have acquired a characteristic of a label, but are units of the process of continuity and individuality that, when one nation in the chain moves, the others naturally move to one degree or another, and each field is an autonomous system in the language system. acts as, enters into hierarchical relationships with other neighboring fields at different levels. Therefore, a paradigm, paradigmatics is not a phenomenon invented by researchers, but reflects the natural processes that occur and can occur in the human mind and thinking, simple and complex actions of a series of imaginations and generalizations in various forms. According to some ideas proposed as a novelty in linguistics, morphological level units exist only in the external structure, and their essence disappears as they descend to the level of "basic semantics". In particular, word groups do not apply in basic semantics.

E.S.Kubryakova reacts to these views and points out that they are unfounded for many reasons: formal-morphological differences in almost all cases lead to a difference in meaning, they are a signal for a difference in meaning or function the method of expression of the content is, first of all, important for itself.

In F.F.Fortunatov's teaching on the word form, the interaction of the formal parts of the word, the existence of "live connections" in them at the same time in the same language, created

conditions for distinguishing between the phenomena of word change and word formation. Organization strict differentiation of the external (form) and internal aspects of the constituent parts, identification of grammatical categories, word groups and their main signs led to the transformation of modern (synchronic) morphology into an independent scientific field.

Limiting the morphological level only to the status of the expression side leads to the rejection of the content units specific to this level, the meaning-task value that emerges through word forms, word groups. However, even at this level, paradigmatic frameworks based on the relative compatibility (symmetry) of content and form at each synchronous stage apply.

In the history of linguistics, although the existence of an objective possibility for mutual comparison and comparison of word groups is recognized, in practice, more importance is attached to dividing words into word groups based on different signs, rather than grouping words on the basis of common signs. The common features of a word led to its being considered separately on the basis of lexical (lexical), morphological, syntactic, word-formation criteria (measures, principles). started to have.

Reacting to the above classifications in the history of science, professor A. Ghulomov writes: "... words are divided into lexical-grammatical groups based on a complex of certain signs (complex signs). Relying only on one side in such a separation, limiting it, does not correspond to the comprehensive nature of words. related to the meaning of action, but these are nouns, not verbs...

The relation to the syntactic situation is very characteristic in showing the impossibility of being limited to one specific sign. For example, the word "moon" (in the meaning of "luna") is a noun (the moon is floating in the sea of the sky): becoming a possessive, complement or indicator is its typical syntactic function. but this word: 1) came as a determiner in the conjunction oy yuz (moon-faced creature), that is, it came in a typical syntactic function performed by an adjective; 2) let the moon go and survive ... in the example of ravish. If we look only at the syntactic situation, it would be necessary to count the first of these as a noun, the second as an adjective, and the third as ravish. is completely different from that of ravishes. When dividing words into groups, taking all of the above signs together and taking into account their mutual relationship implies that the words within a group are the same in terms of lexical and grammatical meaning, syntactic function ... . These phenomena are the main basis for the separation of words into categories, in which the uniformity of words in terms of formal-grammatical properties and syntactic function is taken into account.

According to V.G.Gak, a well-known French linguist, when classifying words into categories, three signs: categorical-semantic, formal-morphological and functional-syntactic signs are closely related to each other, and one common source is the nominative of the word comes from ability.

Academician A.P.Khojiev published a number of articles with the title "Current problems of Uzbek linguistics". Among them, the sixth article expressed his opinion on the phenomena related to word groups and word classification, and expressed his attitude to the views of Professor Sh.U. Rakhmatullaev in this regard. According to A.P.Hojiev, Professor



Sh.U.Rahmatullaev uses the words "category" and "categorization" in reference to vocabulary units and grammatical units. In other words, in the Uzbek language, the unity of the phenomenon of classification of grammatical units with vocabulary units is recognized.

... It can be said in advance that the materials of the Uzbek language, the essence of language units do not confirm these opinions."

Professor Sh. U. Rakhmatullaev stated that the term "word group" was once created taking into account one layer of vocabulary, lexical units; later, it was recognized that there is a second layer in the vocabulary - phraseological units, and it was determined that the classification belongs not only to lexical units, but also to phraseological units. Therefore, taking the vocabulary as a whole, it is not possible to use the term of word groups, now the part of the word in this term does not correctly name the reality. Therefore, it is more correct to mean this concept by the term of classification of vocabulary units. Vocabulary units are initially divided into lexical units and grammatical units, lexical units, in turn, are grouped into lexical units and phraseological units; lexical units are divided into categories within their scope, phraseological units within their scope.

Academician A.P.Hojiev expresses his objection to the above-mentioned opinions, taking into account the achievements and traditions established in the history of science, he writes: "First, the word in the combination of word groups clearly records a specific language unit (lexical meaning unit). The classification is also a phenomenon characteristic of these units - "Vocabulary unit" (lexical unit) basically means a word. Thirdly, as phraseological units are also classified, then it is necessary to express an opinion about the criteria for classifying these units and the existence of "phraseological units" ... entered for some reason. Finally, and fifthly, if lexical units are divided into categories within their scope, phraseological units within their scope, this cannot be categorized as the same linguistic unit.

Professor Sh.U.Rakhmatullaev used the term "lexical units expressing grammatical meaning" for lexical units, distinguishing them from affixes and affixoids, we did not know what kind of unit was meant by "lexical units expressing grammatical meaning" (is there such a unit?) ... It is not justified to apply indifferently to phenomena different from one another, to units related to different language systems, and to work on this basis. It leads to wrong conclusions when determining the nature of linguistic phenomena.

It is clear from the above points that, as in world linguistics, in Uzbek linguistics there is a diversity of opinions on word groups.

In the history of linguistics, although it is recognized that there is an objective possibility to compare and compare word groups, in practice, more importance is given not to grouping words based on common signs, but to dividing them into word groups based on different signs. Common signs of a word are lexical, morphological, syntactic and word formation. caused to be viewed from the point of view.

The paradigm of the system of word groups is a concept that covers specific word groups. If word groups and their specific sub-paradigms (for example, the category of number, possession, agreement in nouns) is a higher level paradigm that relies on lower level

generalizations and considers them in relation to each other. To the extent that the signs specific to individual word groups are objective, the signs within the higher-level paradigm are also objective to the same extent.

In every language, including the Uzbek language, the concept of word groups (subjectivity and its properties; movement, state, quantity, order, sign, and the concept of relation-communication) is a linguistic-epistemological, socio-spiritual product that has been formed historically and passed down from ancestors to generations. Because the traditional classification of word groups formed from ancient times and perfected over the centuries has a deep basis in existence itself, because groups and groups of words are generalized in terms of nominative-onomasiological, meaning and function, they are a product of the dialectic of generality, specificity and individuality, and are different objects in the social consciousness. (the object and its properties, action and state, sign, quantity; connection, connection, relationship) is reflected in the language in a certain way. It is a strong and positive aspect of the traditional classification, in contrast to the theories that argue that it is not acceptable to rely on several dimensions in the classification.

A paradigm of a word-group system is a large paradigm that cannot form another circle, while individual word-groups and their specific paradigms take the form of medium, small, and smallest paradigms. If the major paradigm is a generalized (invariant) unit, the subsequent paradigms are variants of this generalized unit at different levels. Also, the smallest, the smallest and the average paradigms are positioned as constituents of the higher paradigm.

## Literature

1. Admoni V.G. Grammatical structure as a system of construction and general theory of gram
2. mar. M., 1988, p. 114.
3. Apresyan Yu.D. Lexical semantics (synonymous means of language). M., 1974, pp. 24-25.
4. Kubryanova E.S. Parts of speech in onomasiological light. M., 1978, pp. 109-110.
5. Admoni V.G. Grammatical structure as a system of construction and general theory of grammar. M., 1988, p. 114.
6. Ghulomov A.G. Morphology. Introduction.- "Grammar of the Uzbek language", volume II, volume I, Tashkent, 1975, pages 121-123.
7. Gak V.G. Theoretical grammar of the French language. Morphology. M., "Higher School", 1986, pp. 58-59.
8. Khozhiev A. Ozbek tilshunosliging dolzarb muammolari (oltinchi makola). - "Ozbek tili va adabiyoti" magazines, 2007 yil, 3-son, 3-4-bet.
9. Rahmatullayev Sh. Hozirgi o`zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent, 2006, 127-129 betlar.
10. Khozhiev A. Ozbek tilshunosliging dolzarb muammolari (oltinchi makola). - "Ozbek tili va adabiyoti" journals, 2007 yil, 3-son, 4-5-bet.
11. Khozhiev A. Ozbek tilshunosliging dolzarb muammolari (oltinchi makola). - "Ozbek tili va adabiyoti" journals, 2007 yil, 3-son, 5-bet.



12. Kubryanova E.S. Parts of speech in onomasiological consecration. M., 1978, p. 114;
13. Gak V.G. Theoretical grammar of the French language. M., 1986; Large encyclopedic dictionary. Linguistics.M., 2000, pp. 578-579;
14. Eltozarov Sh.D. Linguistic theories about word groups (text of lectures). Samarkand, 1996.