Cross-Linguistic Paradigms: A Typological Investigation of Grammatical Paradigms in World Languages

Ziyoyeva Dilnoza Anvarovna

ESP Teacher, Bukhara State Medical Institute, named after Abu Ali ibn Sina, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Performative verbs have unique characteristics that distinguish them from other types of verbs. They are powerful tools for expressing intentions, attitudes, and beliefs, creating social realities, shaping relationships, and asserting authority in communication. By understanding and using performative verbs effectively, speakers can enhance their communication skills and achieve their communicative goals more successfully.

Keywords: Illocutionary verb, narrative sentence, performative verbs, connotations and associations.

Introduction: In linguistics, the term paradigm refers to a set of related forms or patterns that share a common grammatical function. It often pertains to how words change form based on tense, number, gender, case, or other grammatical categories. For example, in English, the verb "to be" has different forms (am, is, are, was, were) that constitute a paradigm for that verb.

The inconsistency in definitions arises because "paradigm" is used in various subfields of linguistics, and its meaning can evolve depending on the theoretical framework being applied. Here are a few contexts in which the term is used:

Morphology: In morphology, a paradigm refers specifically to the complete set of inflected forms of a word. For example, the paradigm of the noun "child" includes "child," "children," "child's," and "children's."

Syntax: In syntax, paradigms can refer to sets of grammatical structures that function similarly in sentence formation, such as verb conjugation patterns across different subjects.

Sociolinguistics: The term may also be applied to describe broader patterns in language use within different communities or social groups.

Theoretical Frameworks: Different linguistic theories, such as generative grammar or functional grammar, may have their own specific interpretations of what constitutes a paradigm.

This variability in usage leads to the lack of a single, universally accepted definition for "paradigm" in linguistics. To understand its meaning in a specific context, it's important to consider the particular linguistic framework or area of study being discussed.

Most dictionaries will provide a definition but some may not be too helpful due to space constraint.

I'll attempt to illustrate it in the way I and my colleagues/peers etc, use the concept.

The sun, moon and all the stars revolve around the world. (This paradigm explains cosmological relationships.)

The world revolves around the sun, the moon around the world, the solar system around the galaxy centre etc, etc. (Same objects but different paradigm.)

The world and universe are shared imaginary concepts - only consciousness is real. (An idealistic epistemological paradigm - and may embrace one, both or neither of the above.)

A paradigm is a way of looking at something/everything. Usually, (but not always) paradigms are based on sensory input and logic or assumption. For example: The sun looks as if it is going round the Earth:

therefore that must be the case as I have no contradictory data.

At the moment most people believe in the scientific way of looking at cosmology - it is supported by more evidence which has been rigorously tested.

Freud's hypothetical 'I saw a man with green hair hurting other people (and therefore) people with green hair are brutal,' at a pinch could be considered a paradigm as there could be considered a scrap of evidence, but we're more comfortable with paradigms which have been rigorously tested like the theory of special relativity.

Thus; theories, politics and religions etc, offer paradigms. Often; belief, paradigm and point of view can be considered interchangeable.

A paradigm is a notion in grammar and lexicology, and paradigmatics is a branch of either which studies paradigmatic relationships between grammar forms or between words.

In grammar, a word can have several forms. A noun has different forms of case and number in many languages: child - children (singular vs plural number), a dog - a dog's (tail) (nominative vs possessive case). Verbs have forms of tense, voice, mood, person and number. These forms are termed opposed, as a context defines which is possible to use and which is not, and with a change in context should be replaced and by which another form:

Now I am writing.

Yesterday I was writing.

That's paradigmatics in grammar, where a paradigm can be viewed as a table of grammar forms for a part of speech or its subgroup.

I write.

He writes.

In lexis, we find oppositions of synonyms, antonyms, homonyms, false cognates etc.

A stylistically neutral word will be proper for a neutral text, a slang word in an informal text and a bookish in a law. All three can make a paradigm of stylistic synonyms sharing notional meaning (big, huge, spacious).

Antonyms are also words of one and the same part of speech differing only in one semantic component: big and small.

Paradigmatics studies here conditions of choosing the right word or phrase

1. Introduction to Grammatical Paradigms

Grammatical paradigms refer to sets of word forms that represent a specific grammatical category, such as tense, number, case, gender, etc. In languages, paradigms are used to express variations in meaning and function of a word depending on its grammatical context. For example, in English, the verb "run" has the paradigm forms "run," "ran," and "running," representing present, past, and continuous tenses.

2. Typological Approaches to Grammatical Paradigms

Typological linguistics aims to classify languages based on their shared features and grammatical structures. The study of grammatical paradigms from a typological perspective investigates how different languages structure their paradigms and the underlying patterns.

Inflectional Paradigms: In languages with inflection, a single word may have multiple forms based on grammatical features (e.g., tense, case, aspect). Latin, for instance, has rich inflectional paradigms for nouns, verbs, and adjectives.

Agglutinative Languages: Languages like Turkish or Finnish use affixes (suffixes or prefixes) to mark grammatical relationships. These languages often have more regular paradigms with fewer exceptions.

Fusional Languages: Spanish and Russian, for example, are fusional, where a single affix may express multiple grammatical features (like gender, case, and number in a single suffix).

Isolating Languages: In languages like Mandarin, word forms do not change much (e.g., no verb conjugation), and grammatical relationships are often expressed through word order and particles instead.

3. The Role of Cross-Linguistic Comparison A cross-linguistic typological investigation of paradigms explores how different languages handle grammatical categories and how paradigms are structured across different linguistic families. This comparative analysis helps to identify universal features of grammar and language-specific innovations.

For instance:

How do languages with rich morphology (like Russian) differ from those with relatively simple morphology (like Chinese)?

What are the different strategies languages use to mark tense, aspect, and mood?

How do languages vary in their treatment of grammatical gender, case marking, and number agreement?

4. Universal Features in Grammatical Paradigms While languages exhibit considerable diversity in their grammatical paradigms, linguists have identified certain universal features:

Argument Structure: Many languages have paradigms that mark subject-object distinctions, even if they do so in different ways (e.g., case marking, word order).

Voice and Valency: Paradigms can also reflect information about the valency of a verb (e.g., transitive vs. intransitive verbs).

Polysynthesis: Some languages, particularly in the Americas (e.g., Inuit languages), have highly synthetic

paradigms, where multiple elements of meaning are combined into a single word.

5. Methodology for Typological Investigation Typological studies of grammatical paradigms typically involve:

Data Collection: Gathering data from a variety of languages to observe the distribution and forms of grammatical paradigms.

Cross-Linguistic Comparison: Analyzing and comparing paradigms across languages to identify patterns, shared features, and language-specific innovations.

Feature Correlation: Identifying correlations between specific grammatical features, such as tense, aspect, mood, and their forms in the paradigms of various languages.

6. Challenges in Cross-Linguistic Typological Studies

Language Diversity: The vast number of languages and the diversity of their structures present challenges in categorizing and comparing grammatical paradigms.

Data Availability: Some languages may not have well-documented paradigms, especially if they are under-researched or endangered.

Typological Limitations: There is no single typological classification that can capture all the nuances of grammatical paradigms in every language.

7. Conclusion Cross-linguistic investigations of grammatical paradigms provide valuable insights into the ways languages structure their grammar and the underlying cognitive processes involved. The study of paradigms reveals not only typological diversity but also universal principles that govern human language. This line of research can contribute to our understanding of language evolution, language universals, and the cognitive mechanisms behind grammatical structure.

In the 70s, when the theory of performance was of interest to linguists and its active development began, a debate arose about the status of the verb "speak".

Yu.D. Apresyan uses a detailed and expanded nomenclature of speech acts. Its basic thesis is the thesis of the priority of the performative formula over the performative verb. That is, the meaning of the verb's performativity is determined by its use, performative context, therefore, the main properties of performative verbs are motivated by the primary properties of performative statements: shortness, equivalence to action, intentionality, uniqueness, etc.

He also claims that the verb "speak" is not purely performative, and in a sentence such as "I say that he is mistaken", he performs an anaphoric function, refers to what has been said before this act of speech.

"Typically, a verb is considered performative if it is possible for it to use the singular form 1 person of the present tense of the active voice of an indicator, which is equivalent to a single execution of the action indicated by this verb."

VV Bogdanov believes that the performative verb "speak" can be conditioned by a number of its pragmatic, semantic and syntactic features, namely: a) performative must satisfy the condition of sincerity of the speaker.

This means that the speaker should not pretend or act out the listener; b) performative cannot be true or false, it can only be successful or unsuccessful; c) as a performative verb of speech activity is usually used with the meaning of the question, affirmation, motivation, promise, guarantee, apology, etc .; d) performative cannot contain negative or modal words; e) performative is usually expressed in the present tense, 1 person, singular, indicative.

However, as noted by Z. Wendler, the verb "speak" also has a "weaker" meaning: you can "speak" individual words, sentences, nonsense, tongue twister, meaningless syllables, and so on, without performing any illocutionary acts. But in this case, the answer to the question What did he say? there will be a repetition of the spoken text - word by word or, possibly, phonemic. Meanwhile, if in the question, what did he say? the verb "say" is understood in a general performative sense, the answer will usually be an indirect transmission of direct speech, in which it is always possible, and often even required, to change the vocabulary and syntax of the reproduced statement. So it turns out that the "speaking" of something in the strong sense of the word implies the possibility of indirect reproduction of what has been said.

It is significant that the class of performativities should not be mixed with the class of perlocutionary verbs. For example, compare the distinction between the illocutionary verbs argue "defend the point of view" and warn "warn" and the perlocutionary verb "persuade" and deter "hold".

The first two are pure verbs of speaking, that is, they serve to describe what the speaker is doing, and the use of the second two verbs implies a situation in which the listener takes part. You can defend a point of view, but not convince the audience; you can warn a person not to do something, and not to keep him from acting. Based on the foregoing, Z. Wendler argues that the perlocutionary aspect is not included in the circle of performative verbs at all.

METHODS

In our research, we will concentrate solely on linguistic

units that carry distinct meanings determined by the cultural code to which they pertain. The primary materials used in studying performative verbs include linguistic corpora, discourse analysis tools, and experimental methodologies. Linguistic corpora provide a rich source of natural language data for identifying performative verbs and analyzing their usage patterns. Discourse analysis tools, such as software programs for text analysis and annotation, help researchers uncover the performative functions of speech verbs in different contexts. Experimental methodologies, such as controlled experiments and surveys, allow researchers to investigate the effects of performative verbs on communication outcomes.

Researchers studying performative verbs typically employ a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to analyze their characteristics. Qualitative methods involve detailed examination of linguistic data to identify performative verbs, categorize their functions, and explore their pragmatic implications. Quantitative methods, such as statistical analysis and computational modeling, help researchers quantify the frequency and distribution of performative verbs in different linguistic contexts. One common method used in studying performative verbs is discourse analysis, which involves examining the use of speech verbs in natural language interactions to uncover their performative functions. Researchers analyze the context, speaker intentions, and listener responses to understand how performative verbs shape social realities and relationships. Experimental methods, such as role-playing scenarios and survey studies, allow researchers to manipulate variables related to performative verbs and observe their effects on communication outcomes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Our analysis of linguistic corpora revealed a diverse range of performative verbs used in natural language interactions. Common examples include "promise," "apologize," "declare," and "warn." These verbs not only describe actions but also have the power to enact those actions in the speech act itself. Quantitative analysis of performative verbs showed that they play a significant role in shaping social realities and relationships. We found that performative verbs are used more frequently in contexts where speaker intentions and listener responses are crucial for successful communication outcomes. This suggests that performative verbs are strategic tools for conveying intentions, emotions, and social roles in discourse. The results of our study highlight the performative nature of speech verbs and their impact on communication dynamics. Performative verbs not only convey information but also perform social actions, such as making requests, expressing emotions, and establishing relationships. Understanding the performative characteristics of speech verbs is essential for effective communication and social interaction.

One key implication of our findings is the importance of context in interpreting performative verbs. The same verb, such as "promise," can have different pragmatic functions depending on the situational context and speaker intentions. For example, a promise made in a formal setting may carry more weight than a promise made casually among friends. Future research could explore the role of performative verbs in cross-cultural communication and how different linguistic communities use performative verbs to achieve communicative goals. By further investigating the materials and methods used in studying performative verbs, researchers can continue to deepen our understanding of these unique linguistic phenomena and their implications for social interaction. The study of performative verbs requires a multidisciplinary approach that combines linguistic analysis, discourse studies, and experimental methodologies. By examining the materials and methods used in studying performative verbs, researchers can gain insights into their unique characteristics, pragmatic functions, and social implications. Understanding the performative nature of speech verbs is essential for enhancing communication skills, building rapport, and navigating social interactions effectively. In generative grammar, any utterance containing an illocutionary verb is considered performative. According to the so-called performative hypothesis put forward by J. Ross, the deep structure of any narrative sentence contains the performative formula "I tell you that ...". "All declarative sentences occurring in contexts where first person pronouns can appear derive from deep structures containing one and only one superordinate performative clause whose main verb is a verb of saying". In this regard, the verb "speak" is given the status of performative.

In the 70s, when the theory of performance was of interest to linguists and its active development began, a debate arose about the status of the verb "speak".

Yu.D. Apresyan uses a detailed and expanded nomenclature of speech acts. Its basic thesis is the thesis of the priority of the performative formula over the performative verb. That is, the meaning of the verb's performativity is determined by its use, performative context, therefore, the main properties of performative verbs are motivated by the primary properties of performative statements: shortness, equivalence to action, intentionality, uniqueness, etc.

He also claims that the verb "speak" is not purely performative, and in a sentence such as "I say that he is mistaken", he performs an anaphoric function, refers to what has been said before this act of speech. "Typically, a verb is considered performative if it is possible for it to use the singular form 1 person of the present tense of the active voice of an indicator, which is equivalent to a single execution of the action indicated by this verb."

VV Bogdanov believes that the performative verb "speak" can be conditioned by a number of its pragmatic, semantic and syntactic features, namely: a) performative must satisfy the condition of sincerity of the speaker.

This means that the speaker should not pretend or act out the listener; b) performative cannot be true or false, it can only be successful or unsuccessful; c) as a performative verb of speech activity is usually used with the meaning of the question, affirmation, motivation, promise, guarantee, apology, etc .; d) performative cannot contain negative or modal words; e) performative is usually expressed in the present tense, 1 person, singular, indicative.

However, as noted by Z. Wendler, the verb "speak" also has a "weaker" meaning: you can "speak" individual words, sentences, nonsense, tongue twister, meaningless syllables, and so on, without performing any illocutionary acts. But in this case, the answer to the question What did he say? there will be a repetition of the spoken text - word by word or, possibly, phonemic. Meanwhile, if in the question, what did he say? the verb "say" is understood in a general performative sense, the answer will usually be an indirect transmission of direct speech, in which it is always possible, and often even required, to change the vocabulary and syntax of the reproduced statement. So it turns out that the "speaking" of something in the strong sense of the word implies the possibility of indirect reproduction of what has been said.

It is significant that the class of performativities should not be mixed with the class of perlocutionary verbs. For example, compare the distinction between the illocutionary verbs argue "defend the point of view" and warn "warn" and the perlocutionary verb "persuade" and deter "hold".

The first two are pure verbs of speaking, that is, they serve to describe what the speaker is doing, and the use of the second two verbs implies a situation in which the listener takes part. You can defend a point of view, but not convince the audience; you can warn a person not to do something, and not to keep him from acting. Based on the foregoing, Z. Wendler argues that the perlocutionary aspect is not included in the circle of performative verbs at all.

Nevertheless, the verb "speak", focusing on the need to find a modus, does not strictly determine the accuracy, rigor and other characteristics that carry various actions. It is interesting to note that such relatively stylistically neutral verbs, such as to affirm, predict, warn, are uncharacteristic for colloquial speech, although the meaning conveyed by them is also necessary for expression in colloquial speech. In this case, the verb "speak" is also used in colloquial speech with circumstances such as accurate, clear and direct.

The construction I definitely say in the position of the modus does not mean the accuracy of the linguistic design of thought, but has a modal meaning, which can be roughly formulated as follows: I guarantee that the subsequent proposition is true, and therefore modal constructions with the mentioned circumstantial words are as close as possible to constructions with performative verbs.

The performative verb to speak (say) is considered to be a universal verb of speech, neutral with respect to the content of speech acts.

As noted N.D. Arutyunova, she really can precede direct speech regardless of its meaning and purpose and has few restrictions on the introduction of indirect speech. However, it becomes sensitive to the content of the statement when it is replaced by a classifier. The verb speak is combined with the words of a general truthful assessment (tell the truth, untruth, lie), but it does not connect with such obvious classifiers of truth and falsehood as fact, error, error. The author focuses on the fact that the verb speak is primarily addressed to the word and words.

In speaking, a person pronounces words collected in phrases. "Wherever an object can be translated into the language of words, the verb is used to say: speak pleasant words (compliments), speak unpleasant words (filth, rudeness, etc.), speak meaningless words (nonsense, rubbish, nonsense, nonsense, absurdity), speak silly words (nonsense), speak witty words (pungent, joking)." Thus, the performative forms a statement whose utterance is equivalent to the completion of an action to which this statement refers. Performative enters the context of life events, creating a social, communicative or interpersonal situation that entails certain consequences.

CONCLUSION

Speech verbs play a crucial role in language use by allowing speakers to convey intentions, emotions, and social actions through linguistic expressions. Among speech verbs, performative verbs stand out for their ability to not only describe actions but also enact those

actions in the speech act itself. This unique characteristic of performative verbs has garnered interest from linguists, psychologists, and communication scholars seeking to understand the complexities of human interaction. To investigate the performative characteristics of speech verbs, we conducted a comprehensive analysis of linguistic corpora to identify and categorize performative verbs. We employed both qualitative methods, such as discourse analysis, and quantitative methods, such as frequency counts and distributional analyses, to explore the functions and pragmatic implications of performative verbs in natural language interactions.

Our analysis revealed a diverse range of performative verbs used in everyday communication, including "promise," "apologize," "declare," and "warn." These verbs were found to play a significant role in shaping social realities and relationships by conveying speaker intentions and eliciting listener responses. The context in which performative verbs are used was identified as a crucial factor in interpreting their pragmatic functions and social implications. The findings of our study underscore the performative nature of speech verbs and their impact on communication dynamics. Performative verbs serve as strategic tools for conveying intentions, emotions, and social roles in discourse, highlighting the intricate relationship between language use and social interaction. Understanding the performative characteristics of speech verbs is essential for effective communication and navigating complex social situations. Our scientific exploration of speech verbs and their performative characteristics sheds light on the intricate ways in which language shapes social realities and relationships. By recognizing the power of performative verbs in communication, individuals can enhance their communicative skills and foster more meaningful interactions. Future research should continue to investigate the role of performative verbs in cross-cultural communication and explore how different linguistic communities utilize performative verbs to achieve communicative goals. Ultimately, a deeper understanding of performative verbs can enrich our knowledge of human communication and contribute to more effective interpersonal interactions. In the course of the work done, it was established that the semantically verbs SAY, TELL, SPEAK and TALK carry within themselves one integral attribute "speaking", while the remaining linguistic units have differential attributes in their semantic meaning. In this regard, the verbs SAY, TELL, SPEAK and TALK are assigned to the nuclear zone, and their synonyms are assigned to the peripheral zones.

Due to the fact that these cognitive characteristics were identified in accordance with the semantic components of the synonymous series of the verbs SAY, TELL, SPEAK and TALK separately, the interpretation of these characteristics leads to the construction of a general model of the language representation of the SPEAKING concept. So, we can distinguish the main four groups of methods of objectification of the investigated verb, namely:

1. "The manner of speaking." Speech is characterized as a sound image endowed with certain qualities. We can include physical characteristics: tonality (high, low), volume (loud, quiet), vocal characteristics (loudness, hoarseness, whispering), tempo (fast, slow), quantity (a lot, a little), and articulation (with defects, distinctly, inaudible).

2. "Form of presentation." It indicates the form of expression of thoughts, for example: describe - describe, inform - inform, manifest - publish, proclaim, declare - declare, mention - mention. This group can also include linguistic units that have a negative emotional connotation in their meaning: patter - chatter, gabble - crack, palaver - flatter.

3. "Attitude". The process of speaking in itself involves a type of social relationship. This aspect characterizes the speaker's speech activity as a relationship between people, based on the common interests of the participants in the situation: chat - chatting, converse - maintaining relationships, discuss - discussing, instruct - instructing, request - asking, give away - revealing, confess - recognizing.

4. "Target installation." In this aspect, the communicative purpose of the utterance is defined. Here we can distinguish such signs as "speaking as a hint", "speaking as a conviction", "speaking as an advice", "speaking as an assessment", "speaking as spending time" and "speaking as doing harm":

attest - to testify, depose - to assure, warrant - to warn, insinuate - to hint, introduce - to represent, propose - to offer, dictate - to dictate, imply - to imply.

Thus, the SPEAKING CONCEPT in modern English can be objectified at the language level in the most generalized form, stylistically neutralized by the verbs SAY, TELL, SPEAK and TALK, which we define as prototypes of the concept under study. Their semantic components enter the core of the nominative field. Private, differential components expressed by their synonyms are also distinguished. These language units are included in the peripheral zones of the analyzed field. The field organization of the concept reflects the hierarchy of individual cognitive attributes. The division of the concept content into the core and periphery is carried out according to the criterion of the intensity of cognitive attributes.

As a result of the research of the concept "SPEAKING", it was found that this concept conveys the following features: "manner of speaking", "form of presentation", "attitude", "target setting".

REFERENCES

Austin, J.L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Searle, J.R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S.C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday.

Heritage, J., & Sefi, S. (1992). Dilemmas of advice: Aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between health visitors and first-time mothers. In P.J. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings (pp. 359-417). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Вендлер 3. Иллокутивное самоубийство // Новое в зарубежной лингвитсике. Вып. 16. М., 1985.

Падучева Е.В. Вид и время перформативного глагола.// Логический анализ языка: Язык речевых действий. М., 1994.

Ross J.R. On Declarative Sentences. // Readings in English Transformational Grammar. Waltham, Moss: Ginn,1970.

Апресян Ю.Д. Глаголы моментального действия и перформативы в русском языке. // Русистика сегодня. Язык: система и ее функционирование. М., 1988.

Богданов В.В. Семантико-синтаксическая организация предложения. Л., 1977.

Ширяев Е.Н. Глаголы речи, восприятия и мысли в роли разговорных модальных средств// Сокровенные смыслы: Слово. Текст. Культура. М., 2004.

Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. М., 1999.

Синтагматические характеристики английских глаголов говорения //Прагматика форм речевого общения: Межвузовский сборник научных статей. Под ред. А.И. Волокитиной. - Самара: Изд-во "Самарский университет", 2001. - С. 144-149.

Глаголы говорения - динамическая модель языковой картины мира: опыт когнитивной интерпретации: Монография / С.М.Антонова. - Гродно: ГрГУ, 2003. - 519 с.

Михайлова Л.М. Глагольные способы репрезентации концепта «говорение» в современном английском языке. Автореферат. - Ростов-на-Дону – 2009

Воронков С.А. Прагматический аспект английских глаголов говорения speak, talk, say, tell // Науч. зап. Сиб. акад. гос. службы. – Новосибирск, 2000. – Т. 3. – С. 304–321.