

PECULIARITIES OF STUDYING PARADIGMATIC RELATIONS IN THE LEXICON

Hladkoskok Lesia Hryhorivna

Bukhinska Tetiana Victorivna

Cherska Zhanna Borysivna

Candidates of Philological Sciences,

Associate Professors at the Department of

Foreign Languages for Humanities

Yuriy Fedkovych

Chernivtsi National University

Chernivtsi, Ukraine

Introduction. Paradigmatic relations in the lexicon have been attracting the attention of semasiologists since the nineteenth century, and the search for the most optimal ways of studying them has not lost its relevance to this day.

Since the semasiology of the nineteenth century was mainly concerned with the historical study of the vocabulary of the language, paradigmatic relations in the lexicon were considered only in the diachronic aspect. Subsequently, with the spread of the ideas of structural semantics, which began with the famous work of J. Trier [4], paradigmatic relations in the lexicon are again the focus of attention of semasiologists.

Aim of the investigation is to study the main peculiarities of paradigmatic relations in the lexicon of the English language.

Materials and methods. The terms ‘paradigmatics’ and ‘syntagmatics’, introduced into science by F. de Saussure, are widely used in the study of lexical composition of the language. Paradigmatics in the lexicon refers to systemic relations between words, as opposed to linear relations in syntagm. In other words, paradigmatic relations between words are relations in the system of language (langue, in the terminology of F. de Saussure), and syntagmatic relations reflect the properties of the word in speech, text (i.e. in parole, in the terminology of F. de Saussure).

The simplest way of establishing paradigmatic relations in the lexicon has been

known in science for a long time: it is a description of the semantics of a word through its synonyms. Accordingly, paradigmatic relations between words are reflected in explanatory, synonymous, and thesaurus dictionaries, where the semantics of a word is described with the help of other words that are close in meaning, or words are presented in the form of certain groupings united by a common seme or a common concept (synonymous dictionaries and thesaurus dictionaries).

In the era of the rapid development of structuralism, the method of studying vocabulary in the form of larger or smaller paradigmatic groupings, called 'semantic field' (influenced by the ideas of the German linguist J. Trier), became widespread.

Initially, many semasiologists were interested in two main questions: how to distinguish (inventory) the lexical microsystem chosen as the object of study, and how to describe the semantic properties of the elements that form this lexical microsystem. However, soon scientists faced new problems: what objective methods can be used to study the syntagmatic relations between members of the LSG (i.e., the combinability of words that make up the LSG) and how to accurately describe the paradigmatic relations between LSG elements, which was the main goal of our study.

In general, as shown in [3; pp. 235-237], all the main methods of studying paradigmatic relations in the lexicon can be divided into two groups – methods based on the analysis of dictionaries (dictionary definitions) and methods based on text analysis.

Results and discussion. It should be noted that a significant contribution to the study of word compatibility was made by N.M. Amosova, who showed that a word can realise its meaning in three types of contexts: syntactic, lexical context consisting of an 'ideographic group' (for example, the English adjective blind + a group of nouns denoting emotions – love, hate, etc.) and lexical context consisting of individual words (blind + individual nouns). These three types of contexts were later defined more precisely in the works of other scholars: syntactic compatibility of a word (at the level of a word class), semantic compatibility (at the level of a word subclass) and lexical compatibility (at the level of a single word). Accordingly,

adjective compatibility can be studied in the model [word] + [word subclass] or in the model [word] + [word].

In the following decades, linguists have developed various procedures for identifying paradigmatic relations in the lexicon based on textual analysis or dictionary definitions. Most of the research on this issue was carried out at the University of Chernivtsi under the direction of V. V. Levytskyi. These studies are summarised in Levytskyi's book *Semasiology* [3]. Experimentally, it has been established that paradigmatic relations studied on the basis of explanatory dictionaries differ (sometimes quite significantly) from the relations revealed by textual analysis. For example, M. D. Kapatruk found that the greatest similarity between 'dictionary' and 'text' relations is recorded in cases when in texts we take into account not the lexical compatibility of a word (in the model [word] + [word]), but its semantic compatibility ([word] + [subclass of words]) (see [3; pp. 240-241]).

It follows that in order to establish paradigmatic relations in a lexical microsystem, it is necessary to

- a) to analyse a sufficiently large amount of text from which fragments are extracted, which are equal to at least a syntagm consisting of the word under study and its contextual partner;
- b) divide the entire corpus of contextual sets of the selected words into semantic subclasses;
- c) to compile tables presenting the frequencies of joint use of each lexical item under study with each of the identified semantic subclasses;
- d) to process the data obtained by means of correlation analysis;
- e) to build a diagram of paradigmatic relations between the selected words and to interpret this diagram.

Conclusions. So, it should be concluded that paradigmatic relations between words are relations in the system of language. It is a description of the semantics of a word through its synonyms. Adherence to this sequence of procedural steps will allow us to study the paradigmatic relations between the elements of any lexical microsystem in the future.

REFERENCES:

1. Kravchenko, T. P. "Pradigmatic realtions of Ukrainian horticultural terms" *Transcarpathian Philological Studies* 2, no. 39 (2025): 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2025.39.2.3>.
2. Levytskyi V. V. *Lexicology of the German language* / Levytskyi V. V. – Chernivtsi: Books – XXI, 2010. 376 p.
3. Levytskyi V.V. *Semasiology* / Levytskyi V.V. – Vinnytsia: NOVA Knyha, 2006. – 512 p.
4. Trier J. *Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. Die Geschichte eines sprachlichen Feldes. Bd. 1. Von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn des 13. Jahrhunderts* / Jost Trier. – Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1931. – 347 S.