

SOME OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PARADIGMATIC AND DISCURSIVE SYSTEMS

TOIROVA GULI IBRAGIMOVNA

Doctoral Student of Uzbek Philology, Faculty of National University, Named in Honour of Mirzo Ulugbek, Tashkent
Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Summary

The article is based on the idea that the new concept of izosign allows you to pass a graphically as the purpose of a pragmatic-immediate discoursing system, conditions and reasons for implementing a particular speech options from the arsenal of features to the language. In an article on the methodological basis for the diversity of the systems are referred to the structure of discursive system, its differences from the structural (paradigmatic), and introduces the new concept of izosign for the graphics refer to the relevant components of the voice communication system of a special kind.

KEYWORDS: Discourse/Speech Communication, Discursive System, Components of Discursive System, The Ratio of The Elements of the Paradigmatic and Pragmatic Systems, Izosign, Relevant Factors of Verbal Communication, Situational System, Verbal Language, Non-Verbal Language

INTRODUCTION

About the system after works "the universal Organization Science (tectology)" Alexander Bogdanov (1913), "Course of Ferdinand de Saussure's General Linguistics" (1916, Russian translation of 1933) and "System of universal theory" by Ludwig Bertalanffy (1957, Russian translation 1969) so far is written so much that only a list of monographs, collections, scientific periodicals on the subject would be the multivolume Tome. Despite this discourse around interpretation of the system continues to this day, that is, of course, with diversity and multiple general scientific concept of almost all sciences; each sector knowledge understand the system in their own way, while keeping the general that: -the system is indivisible and resistant,-it is complex and consists of various components (items)-component parts within the system are permanent, stable relationships,-in determining the entity of a member within a system of in-system relationships and are more important than the material side of this element-every system has strictly defined place in the hierarchy of the organization object, and performs as part of (which contains microsystem, element) in relation to the parent and as a whole (macrosystem), in relation to a downstream.

Perhaps this is common understanding in different branches of science and starts a chain of almost infinite variation of one branch of one another. Even within science, for example in Linguistics, historical or genealogical understanding system differs substantially from its structural (paradigmatic) interpretation.

Achieving system-structural study of building different languages have thoroughly explore and describe various features of the speech of their structural units. it turned out that for the expression of a value in a language system has so many tools and morecitation index that their functionnrefinance rate may differ from each other expressively, which is almost impossible to bring them to a common denominator, a common, unified paradigmatic one, which in the language of

the structural paradigms a clearly designated place. This has encouraged linguists to give special attention to the study of that what is caused by use of this form of expression of the language of the paradigmatic speech units in this situation-in other words to the study of why to achieve effective verbal communication of recz(e)legal capacity is needed-desirable to use(b)use the materialized option, the invariant locale [Solntsev, 1971, p. 95.]. by the end of the last century, this desire has led to the development of, first, sociolinguistics, and various lingvopragmatics, studying the life and influence of speech units. the pragmatic approach to the study of speech units is that, unlike the structural inventory of the spoken variants of the pragmatics introduces the concept of activity-these options are discussed in close collaboration with dozens of others, most of not linguistic factors of verbal communication. Observations have shown that such situational ethno-, social-, cultural-and individually-psychological factors often are critical, are often more significant than actual linguistic definition of manifestation and determine the efficiency, impact on speech-language options buddy invariant [Greis, 1985,-p. 217-237].

Because the speech communication (discourse) constitute a very peculiar system in the center of which usually is a unit of speech, and her entourage made up of various internal (the actual language- not verbal-linguistic and verbal-linguistic) and external (ethno-, social-, cultural-and individually-psychological) factors relevant to discourse [Arutyunova, 1990.-p. 5-32.;Safarov, 1991] to the extent that within a pragmatic voice system, its components are close to each other and quite stable relations. These mutual relationships were between direct speech pragmatic system components, as well as the system itself is significantly different from that of the structural (paradigmatic) system. The most significant differences between pragmatic speech and language structural (paradigmatic) system are shown in table no. 1.

Table 1: Some of the Differences between Paradigmatic and Pragmatic Systems

Options	In Paradigmatic System	A Pragmatic System
Temporary and local relevance	Anohronnaâ, nesootnesennaâ with certain time and space	Instant, localized, which implements in a certain place and time
Immediate components	Types of one kind homogeneous, asymmetric	One (nearly) digit units of different paradigms, heterogeneous, symmetric
The relationship between the resources of diverse elements	Species differences of one kind	Complementarity and repetition
Lump and joint implementation of ...-integrated components	Incompatible, impossible	There and compatible

Many of the features of the pragmatic situational systems (in particular, changing and updated in the different stages of verbal communication, interoperability and complementarity of direct components, etc.) are closely linked with those of its features.

Because the pragmatic speech system is made up of units of different (linguistic, psychological, ethnic, ethical, aesthetic, cultural, traditional, regional, religious, age and gender of individual, situational etc.) paradigms, then you can pass it as graphically curve/polygonal line, passing on these paradigms and combining in one single-the discursive system-individual units of this indeed heterogeneous, but informative identical or closely related systems. This curved polygonal line could be called izosign [\[1\]](#).

Components of a discourse as situational pragmatic system in artistic works are displayed in different ways. The most convenient for the full transfer of components of the system, of course, are the productions, including feature films. In literary works, the author uses many techniques (author's characteristic of a literary hero, hero's characteristics through

others, allegorical, indirect and allegorical description, etc.) for the transfer of components of the system. These describe the components of discourse can be relatively complete, isolated, full and partial

Often in literary work and at home is widely used by the asymmetry of the components of the discourse that is very often a powerful tool, both positive and negative effects on the verbal communication. These and related questions of artistry and effectiveness of discourse has not yet been the subject of special case studies with these positions, which, above all, due to the novelty of the subject matter. Entered new scientific concept and pragmatic term izosign will visualize this system. Izosign is specifically for each part of the situational (phase) of the discourse and is updated from stage to stage, increasingly long and holistically revealing feature of the hero and his ability to impact on verbal communication. Generic type and approximate content of bases for such izosigna are given in annex 1.

In this diagram shows the horizontal application of the r d o v e components and vertical forms of every kind.

It should be noted that the content of such a framework and relevant to a particular phase of the discourse factors are not limited to these genera and species. In this scheme do not include feature (most) buddy-addressee-collective or individual, that the discourse is as important and as diverse as the speaker's features. The specific situation of discourse can do meaningful to him are numerous, not marked here the circumstances (for example, discourse/contact/distant/mediocre/direct, etc. in the dark/in a noisy or crowded environments, etc.) Furthermore, in certain stages of the discourse situation sometimes makes an important speech, and even critical of any component that has been/was absolutely insignificant, irrelevant in another stage.

Izosign can be graphically represented as a solid line crank, which brings together all relevant to discourse participants signs and factors accounting for the use of this form of vocal expression language invariant, that is a broken line, for example, connecting dots $R\{A\Pi_1^b\}\{A\Pi_2^a\}\{A\Pi_2^b\}\{A\Pi_4^{in}\}\dots\dots\dots$ this annex No. 1

If you can create a generalized schema-based on the relevant factors of the discourse at all (just as something like Mendeleev's periodic table) and label each factor special symbol, the izosign can be passed and linearly as the amount relevant to each specific discourse components.

Thus, the new concept izosign will convey graphically as a pragmatic-immediate discursive the purpose, conditions and reasons for implementing a particular speech options from the arsenal of features to the language.

REFERENCES

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс // Теория метафоры. – М.: Прогресс, 1990. –С. 5-32.
2. Грайс Г. Логика и речевое общение // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 16. Лингвистическая прагматика. – М.: Прогресс, 1985. –С. 217-237.
3. Сафаров Шахриёр. Система речевого общения: Универсальное и этноспецифическое. Самарканд. Сам. отд. Изд-ва им. Гафура Гуляма.1991
4. Солнцев В.М. Язык как системно-структурное образование. -М., 1971. -С. 95.
5. Тринка Б. и др. К дискуссии по вопросам структурализма // В.А.Звегинцев. История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях. - Часть II. - М.: Просвещение, 1965.-С. 155-166.

Table 1 Relevant factors of speech communication Appendix № 1

Exterior (A)									Interior (B)				Informative Significance (D)		
Characteristics Of Speaker (Address Ant) (AI)									Characte ristics Of Commu nication (AII)	Speech Situation (AIII)	Not Verbal-Linguistic (BI)		Verbal-Linguistic (BII)		
Ethnic (AI ₁)	Regional (AI ₂)	Gender (AI ₃)	Level Of Culture (AI ₄)	Social Position (AI ₅)	Age (AI ₆)	Education (AI ₇)	Specialty (AI ₈)	Behavio r (AI ₉)			Kinetic (BI ₁)		Phonation (BI ₂)		Linguistic unity Words collocation,
											{AII ₁ } formal	{AIII ₁ } outdoors	gesture (BI ₁ ¹)		
Russian (AI ₁ ¹)	1 {AI ₂ ¹ } 2 {AI ₂ ² } 3 {AI ₂ ³ } 4 {AI ₂ ⁴ } 5 {AI ₂ ⁵ }	{AI ₃ ¹ } woman	{AI ₄ ¹ } civilized	{AI ₅ ¹ } worker	{AI ₆ ¹ } childish (7-11)	{AI ₇ ¹ } illiterate	{AI ₈ ¹ } housewife	{AI ₉ ¹ } classic	{AII ₂ } At home	{AIII ₂ } At home	head (BI ₁ ²)	mime (BI ₁ ²)	{BI ₂ ¹ } Calm voice	{D ₂ } esteem (distinguish by degree 1...2...3...5...7...)	
				{AI ₅ ² } peasant	{AI ₆ ² } adolescent (12-18)	{AI ₇ ² } Ordinary intelligent	{AI ₈ ² } peasant	{AI ₉ ² } classic	{AII ₃ } At bus	{AIII ₃ } At bus	arms (BI ₁ ³)	Face (BI ₁ ³)	{BI ₂ ² } High voice		
				{AI ₅ ³ } mature (19-30)	{AI ₆ ³ } adolescent (12-18)	{AI ₇ ³ } educated	{AI ₈ ³ } artisan	{AI ₉ ³ } modern	{AII ₄ } By phone	{AIII ₄ } By phone	eyes (BI ₁ ⁴)	{BI ₂ ³ } Rough voice			
Ukrainian (AI ₁ ²)	1 {AI ₂ ¹ } 2 {AI ₂ ² } 3 {AI ₂ ³ } 4 {AI ₂ ⁴ } 5 {AI ₂ ⁵ }		{AI ₄ ² } intellectual	{AI ₅ ⁴ } intellectual	{AI ₆ ⁴ } Middle age (30-45)	{AI ₇ ⁴ } Grammatical literate	{AI ₈ ⁴ } scholar	{AI ₉ ⁴ } fashionable	{AII ₅ } informal	{AIII ₅ } Lecture	shoulder (BI ₁ ⁵)			{D ₃ } humiliation (distinguish by degree 1...2...3...5...7)	
				{AI ₅ ⁵ } old	{AI ₆ ⁵ } Middle age (30-45)	{AI ₇ ⁵ } Grammatical literate	{AI ₈ ⁵ } scholar	{AI ₉ ⁵ } fashionable	{AII ₆ } informal	{AIII ₆ } Lecture	lips (BI ₁ ⁶)	{BI ₂ ⁴ } Gentle voice			
Belarusian (AI ₁ ³)	1 {AI ₂ ¹ } 2 {AI ₂ ² } 3 {AI ₂ ³ } 4 {AI ₂ ⁴ } 5 {AI ₂ ⁵ }	{AI ₃ ² } man	{AI ₄ ³ } intellectual	{AI ₅ ⁶ } intellectual	{AI ₆ ⁶ } Middle age (30-45)	{AI ₇ ⁶ } Grammatical literate	{AI ₈ ⁶ } scholar	{AI ₉ ⁶ } fashionable	{AII ₇ } informal	{AIII ₇ } Written language...	torso (BI ₁ ⁷)			{D ₄ } insult (distinguish by degree 1...2...3...5...7)	
				{AI ₅ ⁷ } old	{AI ₆ ⁷ } Middle age (30-45)	{AI ₇ ⁷ } Grammatical literate	{AI ₈ ⁷ } scholar	{AI ₉ ⁷ } fashionable	{AII ₈ } informal	{AIII ₈ } Written language...					