Check for updates

Paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships in the translation of financial-economic texts

Shokhida Abdullaeva

Independent Researcher (DSc), Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences (PhD), Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This study investigates paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships in the translation of financial-economic texts between English and Uzbek languages. The research examines how linguistic relationships manifest in financial terminology and explores various types of synonymic relationships that emerge during translation. The methodology employs a comparative linguistic analysis approach, utilizing F. de Saussure's theoretical framework on linguistic relationships to analyze semantic and structural relationships between language units in financial contexts. The study examines authentic financial texts and terminology from both languages to identify paradigmatic relationships and semantic equivalences.

The results demonstrate that while absolute synonyms are generally rare in language, they occur more frequently in technical financial fields, though each term typically carries subtle contextual or stylistic differences. The analysis reveals that financial terms in both English and Uzbek form complex systems of interconnected units where words function as part of a broader nominative system. The study identifies and analyzes various types of synonyms – absolute, contextual, stylistic, and emotional – showing how they operate within specific frameworks to enable precise expression of financial concepts while maintaining semantic accuracy across languages.

The research concludes that paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships play a crucial role in understanding and translating financial terminology between English and Uzbek languages. The systematic nature of these linguistic relationships proves essential for accurate translation and effective communication of financial concepts while maintaining appropriate stylistic and emotional connotations in various

professional contexts. This understanding contributes to more precise and contextually appropriate translations of financial-economic texts between the two languages.

Keywords: Paradigmatic relationships, syntagmatic relationships, financial-economic translation, linguistic synonymy, contextual synonyms, stylistic synonyms, emotional synonyms, language substitutability, financial terminology, cross-linguistic equivalence.

Introduction: The richness and complexity of a language's vocabulary is determined through the relationships between language units in its dynamics. These relationships perform a nominative function according to morphological, phonological, and word-formation patterns, revealing the paradigmatic and syntagmatic characteristics of lexical units.

F. de Saussure expresses these relationships as follows: "On one hand, words combine with each other in speech, entering into relationships based on the linear nature of language. This excludes the possibility of pronouncing two elements simultaneously. These elements are arranged consecutively in the flow of speech. Combinations with such continuity can be called syntagmas. Thus, a syntagma consists of two or more sequential units (for example, re-reading; in front of everyone; human life; human death; if the weather is good, we will take a walk, and so on)". …

"On the other hand, outside the speech process, words that share common aspects combine in memory to form groups. For example, the word 'teaching' forms a sequential series with many other words in consciousness (teach, learn, break, education, knowledge, and others) because they are similar to each other in certain features. These relationships are not based on continuity. We call these relationships associative relationships" (de Saussure, 1959).

Summarizing the discussion, F. de Saussure presents the following thoughts:

"The syntagmatic relationship is always present (in praesentia): it relies on two or more elements that equally exist in an actual sequence. In contrast, the associative relationship unites elements that are absent (in absentia) into a potential, mnemonic series" (de Saussure, 1916).

F. de Saussure, in explaining the mechanism of language, emphasizes that various syntagmas exist in linguistic memory, differing in type and length. The functioning of language implies the interaction of these syntagmas at different scales. Language users' choice of word combinations is governed by certain principles, including syntagmatic collocative constraints, semantic logical coherence, and linear relationships of syntactic-semantic structures.

It should be noted that financial and economic concepts in English and Uzbek languages, like in other languages, are not simply a collection of individual words, but rather a system composed of interconnected and complementary units, where no word can exist in speech in isolation, separated from the general nominative system. Words can be classified into various groups based on certain characteristics, for example:

• words with common meanings;

• words with similar stylistic features;

• words with common word formation patterns;

• words connected by their origin, functional features in speech;

• words belonging to active or passive lexical layers and so forth.

The listed systematic connections also encompass entire word classes that are unified in their categorical essence (for example, words expressing objects, attributes, and actions). Such systematic relationships in groups of words united by similar features are called paradigmatic relationships (from Greek "paradeigma" – sample, model).

Paradigmatic connections form the basis of the lexical system of any language. Usually, it is divided into many microsystems. The simplest of these are word pairs connected by meaning opposition, that is, antonyms. More complex microsystems consist of words grouped based on similarity of meanings. These include synonymic series, various thematic groups, and also form a hierarchy of units within them, comparing their types and common features.

Paradigmatic relationships expressed in special concepts allow understanding the similarities and differences between words and their position in the meaning system. The analysis of paradigmatic relationship representations requires correct usage of financial and economic terms, their accurate translation from one language to another, and precise expression in various contexts.

Paradigmatics is one of the two aspects of systematic language study, defined through the identification and opposition of two types of relationships between language elements or units - paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships. Paradigmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies paradigmatic relationships existing in language, their classification, spheres of operation, and similar issues (Great Russian Encyclopedia, n.d.; Baudouin de Courtenay, 2003).

Paradigmatics is understood in a broader sense as a language system itself – a collection of linguistic classes of paradigms. It is contrasted with syntagmatics, as syntagmatics is closer to the language process and text concepts.

The earliest ideas about the existence of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships in linguistics were expressed in the works of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay and N.V. Kruszewski. I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay distinguished between 'horizontal' and 'vertical' relationships in comparing and sequentially substituting language units. N.V. Kruszewski discussed associations based on proximity and similarity. He also put forward the idea that these associations could influence each other and determine language development.

In this study, the syntagmatic influence hypothesis analyzes syntactic and semantic constraints at the combinational level between the head word and target words. Researchers aimed to observe how test participants' evaluations are shaped by these constraints. Paradigmatic influence manifests as a tendency toward continuity between the syntactic and semantic properties of head and target words. According to this hypothesis, when asked to evaluate the grammatical category of target words, relevant rules and meanings in participants' mental memory become activated, creating a certain state of repetition or correspondence.

The structural differences between parts of speech in English and Uzbek languages significantly affect both syntagmatic and paradigmatic influences. In English, parts of speech and syntactic elements combine as different aspects of a unified system, while such correspondence does not exist in Uzbek. In Uzbek, morphological markers are more prominent, and semantic-pragmatic categories are relatively more distinct, but syntactic positions are mainly governed by semantic and syntactic constraints. In English, parts of speech assign roles according to syntactic constraints. Therefore, second language learners whose native language is Chinese are expected to be under stronger syntagmatic influence because the semantically-constrained nature of their language significantly affects their language usage ability.

METHODS

The research employed a comparative linguistic analysis approach to examine paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships in financial-economic texts between English and Uzbek languages. The primary focus was on analyzing the semantic and structural relationships between language units, particularly in the context of financial terminology and economic

discourse.

The study utilized a contrastive analysis methodology to examine various types of synonyms (absolute, contextual, stylistic, and emotional) in both languages. This involved systematic comparison of financial terms and expressions to identify their paradigmatic relationships and semantic equivalences across the two languages. The analysis was conducted using authentic financial texts and terminology from both languages to ensure accuracy in understanding the semantic relationships and usage contexts.

The research methodology also incorporated F. de Saussure's theoretical framework on linguistic relationships, particularly his concepts of syntagmatic relationships (in praesentia) and associative/paradigmatic relationships (in absentia). This theoretical foundation was applied to analyze how financial terms combine in sequential speech patterns and how they form associative groups in the linguistic memory of users in both English and Uzbek languages.

The study examined specific examples of financial-economic terminology through systematic categorization and analysis of their semantic relationships. This included investigating how terms relate to each other within their respective language systems and how these relationships transfer across languages in translation. Particular attention was paid to analyzing the contextual, stylistic, and emotional aspects of synonymous relationships in financial discourse.

The analysis also incorporated theoretical perspectives from various linguistic scholars, including D.A. Cruse's work on lexical semantics, J.Lyons' theories on contextual synonymy, and C.Fillmore's frame semantics approach. These theoretical frameworks were applied to understand how financial terms operate within their respective language systems and how their meanings and relationships are maintained or altered in translation between English and Uzbek.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The paradigm as a linguistic concept is connected with the concept of system used in all sciences. In research, some abstract systems may have a prototype, while others may not. This can be interpreted using examples of English and Uzbek financial texts. For instance: 'Interest rate' is a prototype of the Uzbek lexeme 'foiz stavkasi', meaning it exists as a model. However, abstract categories like 'moliya turlari' (types of finance) or 'to'lov turlari' (types of payment) often do not have a single concrete expression or prototype because they represent system-specific combinations.

The associative relationship of language forms as

systems where linguistic units remind of one another. These relationships form a system in the minds of language users. For example, in Uzbek, the word 'foiz' (percent) may remind of financial terms like 'daromad' (income), 'foyda' (profit), 'rentabellik' (profitability) because they all belong to one financial system. In English, the word 'interest' reminds of words like 'profit', 'revenue', 'gain'. This associative feature of language works both ways. For example: 'profit margin' on one hand reminds of words like 'revenue', 'income', and on the other hand reminds of an opposing system like 'cost', 'expenditure'. In Uzbek, 'daromad' (income) can remind of 'foyda' (profit), 'ish haqi' (salary) on one side, and 'xarajat' (expense), 'zarar' (loss) on the other side. The commonalities and differences of associative relationships have units that remind of each other and share similar or common features. For example, the English words 'interest' and 'profit' belong to the 'financial income' category and unite into one system in terms of pure meaning. Whereas the Uzbek words 'foyda' (profit) and 'daromad' (income) also express 'pure financial result', but they have different characteristics in their own system. From this point of view, language units unite in the system, allowing them to form internal microsystems. Thus, one unit in the system reminds of another, creating connections between meanings.

To form our initial understanding of linguistic paradigm, we turn to a real-world example. We try several different combinations to unlock a computer. Finally, when the correct combination is entered, the computer unlocks. Password combinations are alternative choices like elements in a paradigm. Or when choosing appropriate clothing for an event, we try different options (suit, dress, jeans). The clothing that matches the nature of the event is the correctly chosen element within that paradigm.

A linguistic paradigm is a system of linguistic units that have common features, belong to the same linguistic level, and form paradigmatic relationships with each other. The paradigm incorporates both similar and opposing features within itself, providing options for choice. Units within the paradigm form basic and paradigmatic relationships with each other, and these relationships express associativity, contextual compatibility, and substitutability in the language system.

According to F. de Saussure, paradigmatic relationships are the most fundamental linguistic connections for language units because they determine the possibilities of choice within the internal structure of language. These relationships are determined by how units in the paradigm complement and differentiate from each other in terms of content, structure, and

function (de Saussure, 1959):

A.   When one unit within a paradigm is mentioned, other elements belonging to that paradigm usually come to mind. For example, when one case form is mentioned, other forms within that case system are activated in memory. Similarly, when one synonym is mentioned, it connects to other words in the synonymous series. This process is a manifestation of paradigmatic relationships in language. For instance,

Paradigmatic relationship. When the word 'revenue' is mentioned, other members of its system ('profit', 'income') are activated in consciousness. Similarly, the word 'daromad' (income) also reminds one of 'foyda' (profit) and 'xarajat' (expense). These units unite into a system through mutual paradigmatic connections.

English 'revenue' and Uzbek 'daromad' play the same paradigmatic role. Their semantic paradigm encompasses internal economic categories, for example:

'Revenue' <-> 'Profit' <-> 'Cost'

'Daromad' <-> 'Foyda' <-> 'Xarajat'.

In English, there is a semantic nuance between the terms 'revenue', 'income', and 'profit' (that is, 'revenue' means total income, while 'profit' means earnings after expenses). If the word 'profit' (foyda) is used, words like 'revenue' (daromad), 'cost' (xarajat), and 'margin' (foyda marjasi) come to mind as semantically related elements. For instance, "The company's profit has increased significantly this quarter".

In this context, when the word 'profit' is used, a paradigmatic connection emerges with financial units like 'revenue' (source of profit) and 'cost' (expenses).

B.   For a specific speech situation, one unit is selected from units that are in paradigmatic relationship with each other, that is, from paradigm members. Let us justify this with an example from the context of credit terms:

A text discussing credit terms.

Paradigm: 'Loan', 'Credit', 'Debt', 'Mortgage'.

Selection: 'Loan' (qarz) is used because it expresses the general concept.

English text: "The bank offers loans with a fixed interest rate for small businesses".

In this sentence, 'Loan' was chosen because the general concept of borrowing is important here, while 'Mortgage' is only used for real estate and is not appropriate for the context.

We can see similar examples in the following table (See Table 1).

Table 1. Language paradigms and selection table

Context	Paradigm	Selection	Text	Note
Financial report	Income, Earnings, Profit, Net income	Net income	"The company reported a 15% increase in net income for the fiscal year".	'Net income' represents the pure income remaining after expenses and taxes are deducted.
Credit terms	Loan, Credit, Debt, mortgage	Loan	"The bank offers loans with a fixed interest rate for small businesses".	'Loan' expresses the general concept of borrowing, while 'Mortgage' only relates to real estate, therefore it is not appropriate.
Market analysis	Market share, Revenue, Sales, Growth	Market share	"The company's market share grew by 5% over the last quarter".	'Market share' fits the context where market share is being analyzed, other terms cannot express such information.
Employee wages	Salary, Wages, Compensation, Income	Salary	"The average salary of the employees has increased by 10% this year".	'Salary' provides information about fixed pay, while 'Wages' is related to hourly pay, which is not appropriate in this context.

According to R.E. Asher, syntagmatic relationships express the semantic connection between words that co-occur within a text or sentence (Asher, 1994). B.Hjørland (2014), emphasizing the importance of paradigmatic relationships, defines them as follows: "Paradigmatics demonstrates not the interconnections within combinations, but rather the possibility of substitution between language units. These relationships are mainly based on lexical, morphological, and semantic similarities in language. Paradigmatic relationships provide the possibility of substituting words belonging to the same category with one another" (Hjørland, 2015).

Thesauri and ontologies are often based on paradigmatic relationships. Although many studies have focused on relationships between individual words, Ch.S. Khoo and J.Ch. Na emphasized that semantic connections also encompass relationships between concepts (Khoo & Na, 2006).

Generally, syntagmatic relationships are considered to be based on positioning, while paradigmatic relationships are based on substitution possibilities. However, the question of whether two words or concepts can simultaneously have both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships remains a debatable issue in scientific circles.

The question of whether two words or concepts can simultaneously have both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships is one of the ongoing interesting scientific debates in modern linguistics and semantics. This question is aimed at deeper understanding of connections between words and concepts, and has significant practical and theoretical importance. Paradigmatic relationships typically refer to concepts that exist within the same category. For example, 'aktivlar' (assets) and 'majburiyatlar' (liabilities) belong to the financial balance category and are viewed as complementary concepts, as they can be substituted or compared within the framework of financial indicators.

Syntagmatic relationships express the positioning of words relative to each other and their joint use within a text or sentence. For example, when phrases like 'assets' and 'bilan bog'liq risklar' (associated risks) are used in one sentence, they together serve to explain the financial situation and demonstrate a syntagmatic relationship. In this way, the concepts of 'assets' and 'liabilities' can simultaneously have both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships, which shows their multifaceted nature in financial analysis and reporting. However, examining the question of whether words can simultaneously have paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships presents difficulties. This is because in this case, concepts must be interconnected (syntagmatic) while also having the possibility of substitution within the same semantic category. This issue is based on the following scientific evidence:

M.W. Evens and others emphasize that paradigmatic relationships can be expressed syntagmatically (Evens et al., 1980). This is especially important in lexical analysis when determining the interrelationships between words.

S.Jones observed in their research that paradigmatically connected adjectives are often used together within the same sentence with connecting devices (Jones, 2002). This can serve as an example of the simultaneous existence of both types of relationships.

These approaches serve as a basis for identifying the interconnections between language units. These views are especially important in lexical analysis, as paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships play a significant role in identifying semantic and structural connections between words and phrases. These approaches can also be applied in the analysis of financial texts, as such texts express complex logical and semantic relationships. Below are examples of sentences that align with these scholars' views and their analyses:

In English: "The company's revenue increased significantly, yet its operational costs also rose" (syntagmatic connection: determined through contrasting ideas in one sentence).

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniya daromadi oshdi, biroq xarajatlar ham keskin ko'paydi" (syntagmatic connection: expresses contrasting meaning within one sentence).

In English: "Investors prefer stable returns; hence, low-risk bonds are often more attractive" (paradigmatic connection: connects through different financial instruments via investors' choices).

Translation into Uzbek: "Investorlar barqaror daromadlarni ma'qul ko'radi, shu sababli xavfi past bo'lgan obligatsiyalar afzalroq" (paradigmatic connection: shown through investors' preferences).

In English: "During economic downturns, companies either cut costs or restructure their operations" (Two types of connection: choice (paradigmatic) and cause-effect (syntagmatic) are expressed together).

Translation into Uzbek: "Iqtisodiy tanazzul davrida kompaniyalar xarajatlarni qisqartirish yoki o'z faoliyatini qayta tashkil etish yo'llarini tanlaydi" (Two types of connection: choice (paradigmatic) and cause-effect (syntagmatic)).

According to the example analysis, paradigmatic connection is identified through the relationship between elements that perform the same functional role. For example, in the case of investors, they evaluate multiple choices (high-risk or low-risk bonds) simultaneously. This aligns with M.W. Evens' view, as paradigmatic relationships can be expressed within the same sentence.

Syntagmatic connection shows the logical sequence in words or sentences. For example, the joint analysis of income and expenses (expressing contrasting meanings in one sentence) corresponds to S.Jones' observations.

According to dual relationships, financial texts, especially those concerning economic decisions, demonstrate both types of connections simultaneously. Such cases illuminate contrasting relationships (like cause-effect) through syntactic structure and paradigmatic relationships (choice possibilities). These sentences confirm the approaches of M.W. Evens and S.Jones, as they demonstrate the interconnection of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships in real practice.

According to practical observations, research conducted by G.Bel Enguix, R.Rapp, and M.Zock showed that when creating graphs based on syntagmatic relationships, some words were found to be paradigmatically connected as well (Bel Enguix et al., 2014). This phenomenon confirms the mutual complexity of linguistic phenomena. For example, 'profit' and 'income' can be paradigmatically substitutable since both belong to the financial result category. At the same time, phrases like 'profit increase' or 'income increase' express syntagmatic relationships in a sentence. In this context, the concepts of 'profit' and 'income' can simultaneously have both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships. This situation is important in understanding complex relationships between concepts in financial texts and is effectively used in semantic analysis and drawing economic conclusions. For instance, in a financial report, the phrase 'income increase' can be replaced with 'profit increase', but when these concepts are used together, they express a broader economic context, such as:

In English: "The increase in revenue often leads to higher profits, but these terms should not be confused as interchangeable in every context" ('revenue' and 'profit' can be paradigmatic substitutes, but are used in syntagmatic relationships within a sentence).

Translation into Uzbek: "Daromadning oshishi ko'pincha foyda oshishini ta'minlaydi, lekin bu tushunchalarni har doim tenglashtirib bo'lmaydi" ('daromad' and 'foyda' are paradigmatically connected, but they form a syntagmatic relationship in the sentence).

In English: "While revenue growth indicates market expansion, profit growth signifies operational efficiency" (here, 'revenue growth' and 'profit growth' are paradigmatically related, but together they demonstrate economic results).

Translation into Uzbek: "Daromadning o'sishi bozor kengayishini bildirsa, foydaning o'sishi operatsion samaradorlikni ko'rsatadi" (here, 'daromad' and 'foyda' are paradigmatically related, but express a broader context within the economic text).

In English: "The company's profits grew by 15%, and this was supported by a 10% increase in revenue" ('profits' and 'revenue' are syntagmatically connected to each other, but economic concepts can also be substitutes in a paradigmatic context).

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniyaning foydasi 15%ga o'sdi, bunga daromadning 10%ga oshishi yordam berdi" (the concepts of 'daromad' and 'foyda' are syntagmatically connected to each other, but give different economic meanings in a paradigmatic sense).

Thus, paradigmatically, the concepts of 'income' and 'profit' belong to the financial result category and can be substitutes. For example, in a financial report, the word 'profit' can be used instead of 'income', but when used together, they provide a more precise economic picture.

According to syntagmatic connection, phrases like 'income increase' and 'profit increase' are positioned sequentially in the sentence structure and have complementary characteristics. This approach is important in expressing complex economic relationships and drawing precise conclusions.

The texts demonstrate the simultaneous existence of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships. For example, 'income' and 'profit' are used together to illuminate economic results in a broader context. This aligns with the views of G.Bel Enguix and others and confirms the complexity of linguistic analysis, clearly showing how paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships are expressed in the context of economic texts.

M.Sahlgren emphasizes that paradigmatic relationships are important in linguistics for identifying concepts that do not occur together in one text but are semantically connected (Sahlgren, 2006). This shows that paradigmatic relationships, unlike syntagmatic relationships, connect concepts based on logical and semantic substitutability. This approach is used in linguistics and cognitive analysis to reveal new layers of meaning:

In English: "While revenue is linked to business turnover, profit reflects the company's financial health" ('revenue' and 'profit' explain financial results through paradigmatic connection even when they do not appear together in one sentence).

Translation into Uzbek: "Daromad biznes hajmi bilan bog'liq bo'lsa, foyda kompaniyaning moliyaviy holatini aks ettiradi" ('daromad' and 'foyda' are paradigmatically connected, but they carry separate semantic loads in one sentence).

In English: "Investment in equities contrasts with savings in bonds, though both serve as financial tools for wealth accumulation" ('equities' and 'bonds' are paradigmatically connected, as both are types of capital, yet they are used with distinct meanings in a text).

Translation into Uzbek: "Aksiyalarga sarmoya xavfliroq bo'lishi mumkin, ammo obligatsiyalar orqali barqaror daromadga erishish mumkin" ('aksiyalar' and 'obligatsiyalar' are paradigmatically connected, but are used with contrasting meanings in one text).

In English: "Operational efficiency is the cornerstone of profit maximization, distinct from revenue generation" ('Operational efficiency' and 'revenue' have a paradigmatic connection because they demonstrate the concept of financial processes without being used together).

Translation into Uzbek: "Operatsion samaradorlik foyda oshirishning asosidir, bu esa daromad ishlab chiqarishdan farq qiladi" ('Operatsion samaradorlik' and 'daromad' are paradigmatically connected, but have semantically independent meanings).

From the examples, we can see that paradigmatic relationships show semantic connections between concepts that do not appear together in text. For example, 'income' and 'profit' are often used in different contexts, but they have complementary characteristics in financial logic.

Paradigmatically connected concepts maintain their logical relationships whether they appear together or not. This aligns with M.Sahlgren's views on the paradigmatic approach, as concepts can convey broader meaning even without being used together in a text. These examples further illustrate the importance of paradigmatic relationships in linguistics and financial analysis. This approach allows for more precise identification of connections between complex financial concepts.

Based on the analysis results, we can say that the question of whether two concepts or words can simultaneously have paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships is supported by theoretical and practical evidence. This allows for deeper analysis of the semantic structures of words and their usage within texts. Further studying this issue through empirical research could lead to significant scientific achievements, especially in the fields of linguistics and semantics.

Synonymy represents semantic relationships between words or phrases that have the same or similar meanings. Synonymy is one of the main forms of paradigmatic relationships and is important in understanding the richness and expressive possibilities of language. For example, the words 'big' and 'huge' are synonyms and can be used interchangeably depending on the context. However, the relationship between

synonyms often depends on their subtle differences in meaning and contextual usage.

In his work 'Lexical Semantics', D.A. Cruse makes the following observation about absolute synonyms: "True absolute synonyms, that is, words that can completely replace each other in all contexts without any difference in meaning, frequency of use, or connotation, are very rare in natural languages" (Cruse, 1986: 270). This means that while absolute synonyms may exist theoretically, their existence is rarely observed in practical language. This is because each word has its own unique semantic, stylistic, or pragmatic differences.

Absolute synonyms are rare in linguistics because words usually differ semantically or stylistically. However, in technical fields, such as finance and economics, terminological synonymy is found to occur relatively more frequently. For example:

Revenue / Income – both mean 'income' (daromad):

In English: "The company's annual revenue increased by 10%".

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniyaning yillik daromadi 10%ga oshdi".

In English: "The firm's income depends on its customer base".

Translation into Uzbek: "Firma daromadi uning mijozlar bazasiga bog'liq".

Revenue is used in financial reports to show corporate income. Income is used more broadly, including to express personal financial earnings. These methods show that absolute synonymy is often limited, for instance, profit / earnings. Both mean 'foyda' (profit).

In English: "The profit margin has significantly grown this quarter".

Translation into Uzbek: "Ushbu chorakda foyda marjasi sezilarli darajada oshdi".

In English: "The company's earnings report will be published next week".

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniyaning foyda hisobotlari keyingi hafta e'lon qilinadi".

While 'profit' expresses specific financial profit, 'earnings' is broader, expressing profit before taxes or other expenses.

Expenditure / Expense – both mean 'xarajat' (expense):

In English: "The annual expenditure on research has doubled".

Translation into Uzbek: "Tadqiqotga yillik xarajat ikki baravar oshdi".

In English: "Travel expenses must be reimbursed by the company".

Translation into Uzbek: "Sayohat xarajatlari kompaniya tomonidan qoplanishi kerak".

Expenditure often refers to large-scale or long-term expenses. Expense refers to daily or routine costs. It should be noted that while D.A. Cruse acknowledges the theoretical existence of absolute synonyms, he emphasizes their rare occurrence in practice (Cruse, 1986). In our case, we disagree with the scholar's view. The examples above show that financial terms are often used as synonyms in technical fields, but each word has its own stylistic or contextual difference. The usage of words depends on their semantic and pragmatic characteristics. This reflects the complexity and richness of language.

Contextual synonyms are an important concept in linguistics, and their use primarily helps in understanding the meaning of language units and studying the dynamic possibilities of language. Contextual synonyms are an important field of linguistics, revealing the variable and adaptable nature of language. This concept is a useful tool for translators, writers, and linguists.

Contextual synonyms are words that can substitute for each other in a particular context or situation but do not convey exactly the same meaning in other contexts. As noted in J.Lyons' "Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics" (1968), such synonyms are considered synonymous only in context-dependent situations. J.Lyons emphasizes the following about this: "Contextual synonyms are mainly linguistically or situationally dependent. Their degree of substitutability varies according to changes in context" (Lyons, 1968: 453). J.Lyons' views align with modern semantic research. For example, when C.Fillmore studied context and meaning systems, he examined the impact of contextual synonyms on communicative effectiveness. He states about this: "Words acquire their meaning only within certain domains or contexts, and this sometimes makes them synonymous, but such synonymy is considered highly conditional" (Fillmore, 1985). For instance:

In English: "The company's financial outcome this quarter was worse than expected, leading to serious consequences for investors".

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniyaning ushbu chorakdagi moliyaviy natijasi kutilganidan yomonroq bo'ldi va bu investorlar uchun jiddiy oqibatlarga olib keldi".

In this example, the words 'outcome' and 'consequences' appear to be synonymous in context, but differ in meaning. While 'outcome' refers to a

company's financial indicators, 'consequences' expresses the problems brought about for investors. Similarly, in the Uzbek translation, the words 'natija' (result) and 'oqibat' (consequence) are considered contextual synonyms respectively.

In English: "The recent changes in tax policy had a significant effect on small businesses, with noticeable results in their profitability".

Translation into Uzbek: "So'nggi soliq siyosatidagi o'zgarishlar kichik bizneslarga sezilarli ta'sir ko'rsatdi va ularning rentabelligida natijalar sezildi".

In this example, the words 'effect' and 'results' are used as contextual synonyms. 'Effect' means general impact or change, while 'results' shows the measurable outcomes of this impact. In the Uzbek language, the words 'ta'sir' (effect) and 'natija' (result) can substitute for each other, but they have semantic differences. While 'ta'sir' indicates the cause, 'natija' is the consequence of this cause. This example further illustrates J.Lyons' views: contextual synonyms have substitutability only within context.

In English: "The reduction in interest rates brought a notable impact on consumer spending, with measurable outcomes in retail sales".

Translation into Uzbek: "Foiz stavkalarining pasayishi iste'molchilar xarajatlariga sezilarli ta'sir ko'rsatdi va chakana savdo hajmlarida o'lchanadigan natijalarga olib keldi".

In this example, the words 'impact' and 'outcomes' are used as contextual synonyms. Both describe the consequences of an event, but they carry different semantic loads. 'Impact' has a broader meaning weight, expressing how noticeable the change is in general. 'Outcomes' refers to the specific results or indicators of this change. 'Ta'sir' (impact) means the general change directed at consumer behavior due to interest rates overall. 'Natija' (result) refers to the specifically expressed manifestations of this impact in the retail market, that is, measurable economic indicators. Thus, the difference between synonyms arises from their specific contextual role in the text. Understanding these differences correctly is important for accurate translation and comprehension of economic text.

In English: "The company's business plan focused on expanding its operations, but the chosen approach was too aggressive".

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniyaning biznes rejasi faoliyatini kengaytirishga qaratilgan edi, ammo tanlangan yondashuv juda tajovuzkor bo'lib chiqdi".

'Plan' here refers to general plans, that is, the company's intended strategy for future operations.

'Approach' indicates the method of implementing this plan. In Uzbek, 'reja' (plan) means general objectives, while 'yondashuv' (approach) means the ways to achieve this objective.

In English: "The investment firm developed a plan to diversify its portfolio, but its approach to high-risk markets caused losses".

Translation into Uzbek: "Investitsiya firmasi o'z portfelini diversifikatsiya qilish bo'yicha reja ishlab chiqdi, biroq yuqori xavfli bozorlarga nisbatan yondashuv zararlarni keltirib chiqardi".

In English: "The bank implemented a policy to address the economic crisis, though this strategy faced criticism".

Translation into Uzbek: "Bank iqtisodiy inqirozga qarshi siyosat ishlab chiqdi, biroq bu strategiya tanqidlarga uchradi".

In this case, the words 'policy' and 'strategy' substitute for each other within a certain scope. While 'policy' emphasizes rules and measures, 'strategy' focuses on ways to implement these rules. In Uzbek, 'siyosat' (policy) and 'strategiya' (strategy) also express such contextual synonymy. It is demonstrated that words can only be synonymous within a certain framework or context, and this synonymy depends on specific conditions.

According to C.Fillmore's views, synonymy emerges within certain frames or contexts. These frames determine the degree of synonymy based on how language units are used in different situations. The examples above reveal the pragmatic aspects of linguistics and demonstrate how synonymy manifests in economic texts. This view emphasizes the importance of understanding context when translating financial texts.

Stylistic synonyms are a type of synonymous words that, despite carrying the same or very similar meaning, differ stylistically. They are used in various communicative situations and reveal the aesthetic, pragmatic, and expressive characteristics of language. F. de Saussure explains language's stylistic diversity through stylistic synonyms and describes them as the richness of language. Although stylistic synonyms have the same basic meaning, they express stylistic connotation, social, cultural, and emotional diversity. F. de Saussure says about this: "Stylistic synonyms reflect the richness of language, allowing the speaker to choose words that fit a particular aesthetic or social context" (de Saussure, 1916).

Stylistic synonyms are studied in linguistics through paradigmatic relationships. These relationships allow for analysis of words' synonymity in the same context and their semantic differences relative to each other.

Below, stylistic synonyms are analyzed based on a paradigmatic approach with English and Uzbek examples taken from financial-economic texts:

In English: "The company reported a significant decline in revenue, which was attributed to the global recession".

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniya daromadlarida sezilarli pasayish qayd etildi, bu global inqiroz bilan bog'landi".

Synonyms – 'decline' and 'drop', 'pasayish' and 'tushish'. 'Decline' is widely used in formal and written texts, suitable for expressing economic concepts. 'Drop' is more informal, used for verbal communication. In paradigmatic relationships, although these synonyms express the same meaning, their usage depends on stylistic connotation. Similarly in Uzbek, 'pasayish' appears more formal, while 'tushish' is informal and has a more emotional impact.

In English: "The board decided to implement reductions in operational costs to address the financial crisis".

Translation into Uzbek: "Boshqaruv moliyaviy inqirozga qarshi operatsion xarajatlarda qisqartirishlar kiritishga qaror qildi".

Synonyms – 'reductions' and 'cuts', 'qisqartirishlar' and 'kesishlar'. 'Reductions' is neutral and formal, used in business documents and reports. 'Cuts' has emotional and critical overtones, suitable for informal context. From a paradigmatic point of view, the semantic closeness of the synonyms is differentiated by their connotation. Similarly in Uzbek, 'qisqartirishlar' is more formal, while 'kesishlar' is used more informally and sometimes with a more negative meaning.

In English: "The firm's expenses have risen substantially, leading to a reassessment of the budget".

Translation into Uzbek: "Firmada xarajatlar sezilarli oshdi va byudjetni qayta ko'rib chiqishga olib keldi".

Synonyms – 'expenses' and 'costs', 'xarajatlar' and 'sarflar'. 'Expenses' is a formal word adapted to economic calculations. 'Costs' is more general and suitable for everyday speech. In paradigmatic relationships, these words provide flexibility in different contexts. In the Uzbek translation, 'xarajatlar' gives a formal meaning, while 'sarflar' has a verbal and emotional tone. Regarding analysis in terms of expressive diversity, the following can be cited:

In English: "The company's success in the new market was unprecedented, bringing significant profits".

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniyaning yangi bozordagi muvaffaqiyati misli ko'rilmagan edi va katta daromadlar keltirdi".

Synonyms – 'success' and 'achievement', 'muvaffaqiyat' and 'erishish'. 'Success' is more general and neutral, used broadly. 'Achievement' expresses more emotional and individual accomplishments. Similarly in Uzbek, 'muvaffaqiyat' is neutral, while 'erishish' is more literary and expressive. The paradigmatic approach shows how these words differ through their emotional loads:

In English: "The firm was able to save a significant amount of resources through efficient planning".

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniya samarali rejalashtirish orqali katta miqdorda resurslarni tejashga erishdi".

Synonyms – 'save' and 'preserve', 'tejash' and 'asrash'. 'Save' is more general and widely used in economic texts. 'Preserve' is more emotional and used in the sense of protecting resources. In Uzbek, 'tejash' is more economic and formal, while 'asrash' conveys a more literary and emotional meaning.

In English: "The company's new investment approach was described as innovative and revolutionary by industry experts".

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniyaning yangi investitsiya yondashuvi soha mutaxassislari tomonidan innovatsion va inqilobiy sifatida baholandi".

'Innovative' is used to express neutral and technological novelties. 'Revolutionary' emphasizes more emotional and major changes. In paradigmatic relationships, although these synonyms are close to each other, their stylistic loads differ. Similarly in the Uzbek translation, 'innovatsion' is more technical and formal, while 'inqilobiy' has a literary and emotional tone.

Synonyms in financial-economic texts vividly reflect this paradigmatic system, as they help form purposeful speech through meaning and stylistic differences. The paradigmatic approach to stylistic synonyms is a powerful theoretical tool for deep analysis of language's aesthetic and communicative possibilities.

Emotional synonyms as language units are distinguished from each other by their emotional connotations and differences in speech tone. Although these synonyms carry the same basic semantic meaning, they bring about significant changes in expressing the speaker's emotional attitude, social tone, and purpose. Emotional synonyms are located in the same semantic domain in the paradigmatic system, but they differ in emotional, expressive, and purposeful connotation. This paradigmatic approach helps identify the emotional load and tone of words:

In English: "The company's financial situation is troublesome and may lead to challenging decisions".

Translation into Uzbek: "Kompaniyaning moliyaviy holati mushkul bo'lib, murakkab qarorlar qabul qilishga olib kelishi mumkin".

'Troublesome' and 'challenging' differ emotionally. While 'troublesome' evokes negative emotion, 'challenging' expresses a hopeful and constructive point of view. In Uzbek, 'mushkul' implies negative and difficult aspects, while 'murakkab' is relatively neutral and implies possibility. The paradigmatic relationship shows how these words are chosen based on their emotional loads and communicative purpose.

In English: "The firm's performance was described as impressive, while some investors found it remarkable".

Translation into Uzbek: "Firmaga oid ko'rsatkichlar ta'sirli deb baholandi, ba'zi investorlar esa uni e'tiborga loyiq deb topdilar".

'Impressive' evokes a broader emotional and generally positive impression, while 'remarkable' implies deep attention and achievement in a special form. In Uzbek, 'ta'sirli' is broader and general, while 'e'tiborga loyiq' reflects a more special and deeper meaning. Emotional synonyms reflect emotional and semantic richness in the paradigmatic system.

In English: "The downturn in the market was labeled as alarming by experts, though others saw it as manageable".

Translation into Uzbek: "Bozordagi pasayish mutaxassislar tomonidan tashvishli deb baholandi, ba'zilari esa buni boshqariladigan holat sifatida ko'rdi".

'Alarming' is enriched with emotion and evokes concern, while 'manageable' indicates possibility and control. In Uzbek, 'tashvishli' implies danger, while 'boshqariladigan' indicates hope and possibility of control. This shows how paradigmatic relationships reflect emotional and social diversity.

Thus, emotional synonyms provide emotional diversity in the paradigmatic system and allow synonyms to manage emotional impact. They facilitate achieving communicative goals. The choice of synonym matches the listener's or reader's reaction. They enhance speech aesthetics and allow selecting words appropriate to social and emotional context. Emotional synonyms in financial-economic texts reflect different perspectives in terms of emotional load and tone, which clarifies and enriches speech. The paradigmatic relationship helps to understand more deeply how they complement each other within the system and their role in context.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships in financial-economic texts reveals that these linguistic connections play a crucial role in understanding and translating financial terminology between English and Uzbek languages. The study demonstrates that while absolute synonyms are rare in general language use, they occur more frequently in technical financial fields, though each term often carries its own subtle contextual or stylistic differences. The examination of contextual, stylistic, and emotional synonyms shows how these relationships operate within specific frameworks, allowing for precise expression of financial concepts while maintaining semantic accuracy across languages.

The research findings also support the theoretical frameworks proposed by F. de Saussure regarding syntagmatic relationships (in praesentia) and paradigmatic relationships (in absentia), particularly in how they manifest in financial-economic discourse. The study demonstrates that financial terms in both English and Uzbek languages form complex systems of interconnected and complementary units, where words cannot exist in isolation from the general nominative system. This systematic nature of linguistic relationships proves essential for accurate translation and effective communication of financial concepts between the two languages, while maintaining the appropriate stylistic and emotional connotations required in various professional contexts.

REFERENCES

Asher, R.E. (1994). The encyclopedia of language and linguistics. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Baudouin de Courtenay, I.A. (2003). New illustrated encyclopedia. Moscow: Great Russian Encyclopedia.

Bel Enguix, G., Rapp, R., & Zock, M. (2014). A graph-based approach for computing free word associations. In Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (pp. 3027–3033). Reykjavik, Iceland: European Language Resources Association.

Cruse, D.A. (1986). Lexical semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

de Saussure, F. (1916). Course in general linguistics (C.Bally & A.Sechehaye, Eds.). Paris: Payot.

de Saussure, F. (1959). Course in general linguistics (W.Baskin, Transl.; C.Bally & A.Sechehaye, Eds.). New York: Philosophical Library.

Evens, M.W., Litowitz, B.E., Markowitz, J.A., Smith, R.N., & Weaner, O. (1980). Lexical-semantic relations: A comparative survey (Current Inquiry into Language and Linguistics No. 34). Carbondale, IL, and Edmonton, Ontario, Canada: Linguistic Research, Inc.

Fillmore, C. (1985). Frames and the semantics of understanding. Quaderni di Semantica, 6, 222–254.

Great Russian Encyclopedia. (n.d.). Paradigmatics. In Great Russian Encyclopedia online. Retrieved December 26, 2024, from https://old.bigenc.ru/linguistics/text/2706665.

Hjørland, B. (2015), Are relations in Thesauri "Context-free, definitional, and true in all possible worlds"?. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 66(7), 1367–1373. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23253.

Jones, S. (2002). Antonymy: A corpus-based perspective. New York: Routledge.

Khoo, C.S.G., & Na, J.C. (2006). Semantic relations in information science. Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, 40(1), 157–228. https://doi.org/10.1002/aris.1440400112.

Lyons, J. (1968). Introduction to theoretical linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sahlgren, M. (2006). The word-space model: Using distributional analysis to represent syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between words in high-dimensional vector spaces [Doctoral dissertation, Stockholm University]. The Digital Scientific Archive. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A189276&dswid=2550