

A PARADIGMATIC

AND SYNTAGMATIC DESCRIPTION OF LEXEMES IN GERMAN LANGUAGE

UNA DESCRIPCIÓN PARADIGMÁTICA Y SINTAGMÁTICA DE LOS LEXEMAS EN EL IDIOMA ALEMÁN

Khuraman Asgerova ¹

Email: eskerovakhuraman@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5876-1836>

¹ Azerbaijani University of Languages, Azerbaijan.

Suggested citation (APA, seventh ed.)

Asgerova, K. (2024). A paradigmatic and syntagmatic description of lexemes in german language. *Universidad y Sociedad*, 16 (1), 435-442.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the article is to investigate the paradigmatic and syntagmatic representation of lexemes in the German language. This work is devoted to the study of the lexico-semantic group of lexems in German as a tool for implementing a systematic approach in the study of the lexico-semantic system of the language, considering the specifics of verbal semantics, various approaches to the interpretation of memory verbs, identifying structure of the internal organization of a given paradigmatic units and describing their paradigmatic relationships. The establishment of systemic relationships testifies to the completed integration of words in new meanings into the lexico-semantic system of the german language. The entry of syntagmatic description into the lexico-semantic system of the language determines the qualitative and quantitative transformation of the vocabulary as a whole. The emergence of new lexico-semantic variants leads to significant changes within the lexical fund. The dynamics of the semantic structure of a single word determines the development of the German vocabulary as a whole, its qualitative and quantitative transformation. Qualitatively, the composition of lexico-semantic groups becomes more complicated, new synonymic and antonymic relations develop, and the existing derivational connections of words are differentiated. In quantitative terms, the emergence of semantic neologisms is a powerful factor in the development of vocabulary, since the stems of words in new meanings are widely used in word formation to create new names.

Keywords: paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, systematic, lexical-semantic fields.

RESUMEN

El propósito del artículo es investigar la representación paradigmática y sintagmática de los lexemas en la lengua alemana. Este trabajo está dedicado al estudio del grupo léxico-semántico de lexemas en alemán como herramienta para implementar un enfoque sistemático en el estudio del sistema léxico-semántico de la lengua. Se consideran los detalles de la semántica verbal, varios enfoques para la interpretación de los verbos de memoria, la identificación de la estructura de la organización interna de unidades paradigmáticas dadas y la descripción de sus relaciones paradigmáticas. El establecimiento de relaciones sistémicas atestigua la integración completa de palabras con nuevos significados en el sistema léxico-semántico de la lengua alemana. La entrada de la descripción sintagmática en el sistema léxico-semántico de la lengua determina la transformación cualitativa y cuantitativa del vocabulario en su conjunto, mientras que la aparición de nuevas variantes léxico-semánticas conduce a cambios significativos dentro del fondo léxico. Se encontró que cualitativamente, la composición de los grupos léxico-semánticos se vuelve más complicada a medida que se desarrollan nuevas relaciones sinónimas y antonímicas y se diferencian las conexiones derivativas de palabras existentes. En términos cuantitativos, la aparición de neologismos semánticos es un factor poderoso en el desarrollo del vocabulario, ya que las raíces de las palabras con nuevos significados se utilizan ampliamente en la formación de palabras para crear nuevos nombres.

Palabras clave: relaciones paradigmáticas y sintagmáticas, sistemática, campos léxico-semánticos.

INTRODUCTION

German is one of the most important languages worldwide. According to the Editors of Britannica Encyclopaedia (2023) it serves as the official language in both Germany and Austria, and it holds official status in Switzerland as well. German is classified within the West Germanic branch of the Indo-European language family, alongside English, Frisian, and Dutch (Netherlandic, Flemish). The historical documentation of Germanic languages commences with the initial interactions between their speakers and the Romans during the 1st century BCE. During this period and for several subsequent centuries, a singular "Germanic" language existed, marked by minor dialectal distinctions. It is only from approximately the 6th century CE onwards that one can refer to a distinct "German" language, specifically High German. Presently, German boasts over 90 million native speakers, and it is taught as well as a foreign language, positioning it among the languages with the highest number of speakers globally (Glück, 2014).

The grammatical phenomena, processes, and idioethnic features play a significant role in shaping the distinctive characteristics and syntactic structure of the German language (Brucher et al., 2020; Hopp & Putnam, 2015). Specific properties are evident in marking functions related to categorical order, such as impersonality formed by the "es" element, indirect speech formed by conjunctive I, and gender manifested in a unique form (Babenko, 2022). Additionally, research on German heritage speakers in a predominantly English context has uncovered differences in the approach to clause type optionality across registers. The influence of the dominant majority language on the heritage language is also evident. Moreover, the German language exhibits a unique tradition of using word pairs as a distinctive group of phraseologisms. These contribute to the vibrancy and visual embellishment of human expressions. Understanding these phraseologisms is crucial for comprehending the syntactic and semantic structure of the German language (Azamatovna & Salijanovna, 2020).

Learning German poses several significant challenges (Chavez, 2017; Kaiser et al., 2014). A primary hurdle involves mastering the correct usage of definite articles (der, die, das) and indefinite articles (ein, eine), which vary based on gender and grammatical case. Another complex aspect is navigating the grammatical cases—nominative, accusative, dative, and genitive—each requiring specific endings for nouns, articles, adjectives, or pronouns. Grasping the grammatical gender (masculine, feminine, neuter) of each noun can also be challenging (Bender et al., 2011). Additionally, there's the matter of declensions, involving distinct patterns of endings that nouns

follow when inflected, necessitating thorough memorization. Further complicating matters, verbs are typically placed at the end of sentences in German, making it challenging to fully understand the sentence until reaching the verb. Moreover, the language forms very long compound words by combining nouns, and understanding the meanings of these compounds requires learning to break them down. Lastly, the existence of various dialects and regional variants, each with its peculiarities, accents, and vocabularies, adds another layer of complexity.

When analyzing German words in lexical-semantic variants we notice that they are organized and function on the basis of internal regularities specific to the lexical-semantic system of the language as a whole. The originality of semantic words mainly depends on the nature of the system relations established between them and existing or new lexical units. They are complex, diverse and are manifested in various semantic relations of lexical units, features of their interaction with each other. When considering the system relations in the lexical composition, it is noted that the lexical-semantic system, which consists of the synthesis of the complex interaction of words and their meanings, is sorted into three main structural directions - paradigmatic, syntagmatic and derivational directions.

It is important to highlight that in linguistic analysis, paradigms and phrases play crucial roles in comprehending the structure and significance of language. A paradigm denotes a collection of interconnected words or forms sharing a common characteristic, be it grammatical category or meaning. This concept aids linguists in dissecting the connections among diverse linguistic elements. On the other hand, phrases serve as fundamental units of both meaning and syntax in language. They offer valuable insights into the amalgamation of words to convey particular meanings and fulfill distinct grammatical functions. In our opinion, much research has been done on the linguistic structure of words in German, however, the topic of lexical-semantic structure has not been widely studied. Considering this, the objective of this work is to investigate the paradigmatic and syntagmatic representation of lexemes in the German language. To accomplish this goal several methods are used as critical discourse analysis, and post-structuralist discourse analysis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

To conduct this work, the linguistic analysis method was mainly used. Linguistic analysis is a method utilized to explore and comprehend the structure, significance, and application of language within texts or discourses. It finds application across various domains, including psychology, social sciences, and computer science, enabling the

examination of linguistic elements in texts and the derivation of insights into the underlying concepts or phenomena (Dixon, 2021; Gardin, 1973). For example, the linguistic analysis of neologisms, or newly created words, can provide insights into the evolution of language and the societal context in which these words emerge (Elsen & Kodantke, 2022). On the other hand, a linguistic analysis of patients with diseases or disabilities is useful to identify several linguistic features that characterize them, and this way increases their quality of life enabling better communication (Bryant et al., 2016).

Within this framework, the paradigmatic and syntagmatic description of lexemes entails scrutinizing the associations among words within a language. This examination centers on the interconnections among lexemes through derivational relations, aligning with paradigms and their syntactic and semantic contexts. As an illustration, the *Démonette* database represents a partial implementation of ParaDis, a paradigmatic model of morphological representation crafted for delineating regular processes and form-meaning variations in French derivational morphology (Namer & Hathout, 2020). Another example would be the work of Sánchez Hernández (2016) where it is presented a bilingual dictionary which incorporates paradigmatic and syntagmatic information, aiming to fill the gap in German-Spanish bilingual lexicography. These examples demonstrate the application of paradigmatic description in various linguistic contexts, emphasizing the importance of understanding the relationships between lexemes within a language.

RESULTS-DISCUSSION

The systematic study of the lexicon is not only the determination of semantic fields, but also the determination of relationships between words. In traditional linguistics, when there was no systematic approach, the connections between lexemes were carried out outside the field. At that time, they took the idea that not all parts of the lexicon are systematic in the same way. It is not easy to find lexemes that correspond to every concept in terminology. As in all other semiotic systems, one can talk about paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations in language. Below we will talk about the paradigmatic relations of signs, that is, lexemes. Krongauz (2005, p. 169) writes that "When we say paradigm, we will understand a group of elements that have certain common features (in semantics, we naturally talk about language signs), but differ in some way". It is known that semantic comparison, like all comparisons, requires a basis for comparison.

It is advantageous to conduct paradigmatic relations within a paradigm. From the semantic point of view, the

most important paradigmatic relations are manifested between synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, paronyms, etc. groups of words. Polysemy should be mentioned among them. Because the name remains the same, the expressed objects differ. The passing of the name plays an important role here. When the Germans say /Die Nase des Flugzeugs/ (the nose of the plane), they don't know why they call it that. But in fact, it is called so because it resembles a human nose. Ambiguity is usually given in a dictionary, but a trop (figurative expression) is not. For example, in the "German-Azerbaijani dictionary", the word /Land/ has 4 meanings: 1) ölkə, məmləkət, dövlət; (state, country) 2) torpaq, yer (earth, space); 3) quru (ground); 4) kənd (village). Baku people use /heyvan bala/(animal cub) in the sense of simile. However, this is not mentioned in the dictionary.

It would be appropriate to talk about the second metaphor. A metaphor is a simile. For example, /ətək/ (hem) is called the lower part of a person's clothes. The Germans mean the lowest part of the mountain by saying /Am Fuß des Berges/. In fact, the mountain does not have a foot, so it is necessary to take into account such subtleties during translation. Functional similarity plays an important role in conveying meaning. In the example we gave above, namely /Die Nase des Flugzeuges/, functional similarity played a decisive role. In addition, several types of metonymy are distinguished. For example, /pen/ in English means not only an instrument for writing or drawing with ink, but also an artistic style. There is a "Pen club" in France. Synecdoche occupies an important place in metaphors and similes. For example, /Die ganze Welt spricht heute von N. Suleymanov/(The whole world is talking about N. Suleymanov). Of course, exaggeration is obvious here. In other words, it is a big exaggeration saying that the whole world is talking about one person.

Now let's talk about synonyms. Synonym is generally used to refer to words that have a similar meaning between different language units. In other words, the main source of synonyms is the expression of the same subject in different ways. In itself, this can be observed between individual words and syntactic structures. Russian linguist A. A. Reformatzky (2001, p. 100) cites the example of Jose Raul Capablanca, who became the world champion in 1921-27, as an example of different names of the same person. He writes: 1) his name - Capablanca; 2) his nickname Kana to indicate his origin; 3) to indicate his position - Cuban champion; 4) to state the position - the winner of Lasker; 5) world champion - winner; 6) Chess player who lost to Alekhine.

The following examples of synonymy of lexemes can be shown:

- Brötchen-Semmel (fat cookie)
- Samstag- Sonnabend (Saturday)
- Vater und Mutter- Eltern (parents)

However, if one word is a dialect word and the other is a literary language word, they are usually called heteronyms. For example /Schornsteinfeger-Essenkehrer/ (steam cleaner). As an example of synonymy at the syntactic level, we can show the following examples:

- Er fordert mich auf zu gehen// (He makes me go)
- Er fordert mich zum Gehen auf// (He makes me go)

Synonymy can usually be shown by control. To check whether the words /exakt, genau and precise/ are synonymous in a text in German, let's turn to the following sentences:

- Er führt die Arbeit exakt aus// (He greatly does his task)
- Er hat die Aufgabe genau geprüft// (He checked the task carefully)
- Der Text wurde präzise überprüft// (The text has been checked for accuracy).

Antonyms play an important role in revealing paradigmatic relations. Antonyms are words with opposite meanings. Antonyms are arranged according to the principle of either-or conversion:

- Antonyms according to the either-or principle: //bebaut-/unbebaut/ (built-unbuilt).
- According to the principle of convertibility: /kaufen-verkaufen/ (buy-sell), etc.

In addition to synonyms and antonyms, we can also distinguish a group of words, which are called hyponyms. Hyponyms can be attributed to the relationship between general and specific concepts. For example /Apfel-Frucht/ (apple-fruit), /Schloss- Arbeiter/ (locksmith-worker). In these examples, the second given is general and the first given is specific. /Apple/ is a type of fruit, and fruit can never be understood as a type of apple. The fruit hyponym also includes pears, oranges, lemons, pineapples, etc.

They distinguish meronymy among paradigmatic relations. A meronym is a relationship between a whole and a part. Mereonym is not mentioned by many linguists, for example German scholar Thea Shipman. To understand this clearly, let us refer to the following examples: /die Person/ = /das Ohr/, /die Nase/ and /das Auge/. This means that if we are talking about a person, his ears, nose,

eyes and other body parts are also included. Meronymy is similar to hyponyms because here too one word is set against several words. For example, it is a hyponym for /Pflanze/ (tree, oak) etc. In contrast to these, words that do not correspond to each other in meaning can also be distinguished. For example /schwarz/ (black)-/weiß/ (white)-/rot/ (red)-/blau/ (blue). These can be referred to as antonyms because they cannot represent the same object.

When we talk about paradigmatic relations, we should also mention taboos and euphemisms. Taboos are words that are not accepted in society. Euphemisms are words that can be used. An example of the first is /Sie lügen/ (You lie) in German instead of /Sie irren sich// or /Sie haben nicht Recht// etc. Paronyms also occupy a special place in terms of paradigmatic relations in the German language. Conducting a revision we have identified up to 400 pairs of paronyms from various sources. At this time, we mean word pairs that formally differ by one or more phonemes. In the second stage, these word pairs were grouped by parts of speech. The collected language material is distributed as follows:

1. Noun paronyms - 150
2. Verb paronyms - 80
3. Adjective paronyms - 150 (Askerova, 2014).

The encounter of the pairs “Das Gesinde” (housemaid, servant) and “das Gesindel” (rubbish) shows that they differ only in the /-l/ consonant. In general, paronyms can be grouped as follows:

1. Paronyms formed by adding a phoneme at the end of the word. E.g.: “die Barte” (carpenter's tool) - “die Bartel” (fish whisker) etc.
2. Sometimes paronymic pairs are also observed in borrowed words. In this case, the word on both sides of the encounter is of foreign origin, but the phoneme diversity within the word acts as the basis for the creation of a paronymic pair. E.g.: words borrowed from the French language: “der Adressant” (speaker) - “der Adressat” (listener), etc. Since these words are from the same root, modern linguistics combine them under the name of paronomasia. It is taken as a basis to differentiate the vowel in those words by nasalization or not. On the contrary, it is possible to explain the change in the composition of words such as “die Dame” (woman, lady) - “der Damel” (fool,) etc., in the German language neither etymologically, nor semantically, nor formally.
3. Linguistic material shows that pairs formed by the meeting of different consonants within the word can

often be found. For example: “die Ahle” (needle) - “die Ahne” (grandparent) etc.

4. Pairs formed by increasing one phoneme in the middle of the word. For example: “der Keller” (cellar) - “der Kellner” (waiter, restaurant attendant)
5. Pairs formed by the vowel in the word taking umlaut. For example: “die Buhne” (wrap) - “die Bühne” (stage) etc.
6. In some cases, pairs containing two different phonemes. For example: “das Gebröckel” (shrapnel, cloth) - “das Gebrodel” (boiling) etc.

A large number of nominal paronyms are pairs of antonyms distinguished by differences between vowels and consonants in the middle of the word. As an example, we can show the following example: “das Dunkel” (darkness) - “der Dunkel” (arrogance, arrogance). Thus, the analysis of the language material shows that the distinction is based on a sign (e.g. /der Fluß/ (flow, river), /die Flut/ (flutter). Here the distinction is made by the type of consonant or the length and shortness of the vowel. For example, /Quelle/ (source)/Quehle/ or with phonemes that have no similarity: /die Feige/ (fig) - /die Feile/ (to eat), etc.

Thus, we analyze 150 pairs of noun paronyms according to their formal differences, and conclude that these paronyms mean semantically a completely different thing, event, subject or denotation, although the difference in their phonetic structure is a differential sign, a phoneme, or based on two phonemes. Although in most cases these pairs of paronyms have the same grammatical gender, sometimes we witness that they belong to different genders.

The quantitative expansion of paronyms mainly occurs due to the phonemes /t/, /n/, /l/, /ə/, /r/. E.g.:

- “Buch” (book) - “Buche” (peanuts);
- “Lade” (box) - “Laden” (luggage, store);
- “Reihe” (row) - “Reiher” (heron);

Qualitative difference is a condition for alternation to phoneme alternation (switching of one sound to another sound in word roots) to those that are articulatory close, often differing by a differential feature. The following qualitative difference applies to the group of paronyms distinguished by one phoneme.

1. long vowel-short vowel: “Staat” (state) - “Stadt” (morning) etc.
2. open vowel-close vowel: Putte (turkey) - Putte (male turkey)
3. diphthong-monophthong: “leiblich” (body) - /li:plLç/ (dear) etc.

4. front lip vowels-front non-lip vowels: “lösen” (to solve) - “lesen” (to read) etc.
5. with vowels of different order and rise, and sometimes with vowels of different order: “Last” (load) - “Lust” (desire) etc.
6. voiced and voiceless consonants: “Bein” (ass) - “Pein” (pain) etc.
7. occlusive-explosive consonants: “Salbe” (rubbing drug) - “Salve” (volley fire), etc.;
8. Consonants (affricates): “Beil” (axe) - “Pfeil” (arrow) etc.
9. Consonants with flowing-molding-explosive groove: “beißen” (to bite) - “beisen” (to lick) etc.

It's important to mention that some of these groups can be combined. For example, it can be assumed that the phonological difference given in the same way is expressed in writing. “Vowel with umlaut-vowel without umlaut”. /ö//o; ü//u; ä//a/ etc. The qualitative difference of the second group of paronyms is similar, but two or three phonemes are touched, perhaps the quantity changes at the same time. Often there is a clash due to the length and shortness of the vowels and at the same time the ringing and deafness of the consonants. Long vowels often come before voiced consonants, and short ones come before deaf ones. For example: “pflügen” (to plow) - “pflücken” (to thresh) etc. Furthermore, there are specific features of nominal paronyms are morphological differentiation in some paronyms. Semantic separation is protected and maintained not only by phonemic difference, but also by gender and case difference.

Incomplete sound similarity occurs in all related grammatical forms. From this point of view, one can distinguish between complete paronyms and partial paronyms. Paronym-nouns refer to full paronyms. The degree of sound similarity can vary slightly, depending on whether the paronyms belong to different types of case and plural form. Paronym-adjectives are also called full paronyms. In the sentence, the adjective appears in one of two forms - either inflected or uninflected. The form of choice depends on the function of the adjective in the sentence, that is, the adjective acts in the sentence in the determining, predicative and adverbial (adverbial) function. The degree of sound similarity varies slightly in the shortened form compared to the shortened form. Most of the verb paronyms are partial, incomplete paronyms. Imperfect sound similarity is often observed in indefinite forms, and it is precisely in the present tense of such verbs. If the verbs belong to different types of personification and different ablaut, the imperfect sound similarity in the preterite

and participle II decreases or disappears completely. E.g.: "reisen" (to travel) - "reißen" (to tear) etc.

Complete formation is divided into paronyms, and incomplete formation is divided into word combinations according to the signs of individual formation. Paronyms have different morphological lexical structures. These monomorpheme (root and derivative) and polymorpheme are derived, compound and compound-derivative words. Paronymic pairs form a morpheme of one type such as a word, and a word-forming component also forms a component of a different type. Foreign suffixes play an active role in the group of homonymous nouns: /-and, -ant, -ent -at - (t) eur-(t) or/. But here from the real German suffixes /-heit, -igkeit, -keit, -ig; -keit; -ung; -er/ suffixes are more frequent. Suffixes /-ig -lich -isch-al-ell/ are more actively involved in the formation of paronyms with the same root - adjectives. Derivative verbs with multiple morphemes are formed with the help of prepositions. The suffixes /-el, -er, -ig, -ier, -isier, -ifizier/ change the semantics of the verb. Establishing regularity, associating the character of semantic separation with certain suffixes, rarely ends in success.

Paronyms with different roots have similar and completely compatible, sometimes homophonically correcting morphemes or homophonically sounding correcting morphemes. The suffixes /-ion, -or, -at, -ens, -e, -er, -ung/ are encountered more than others in the group of paronyms with various roots. Suffixes /-ig, -isch, -lich/ are actively involved in forming paronymous adjectives with different roots. Paronymous words, when used in a sentence or text, often create misunderstandings and make language learning difficult. Which words act as paronyms depends a lot on the speaker's level of education, social and regional affiliation, and language environment.

The problem of formally similar, similar-looking or close-sounding words being often mistakenly confused with each other in specific sentences remains controversial to this day. This debate is clearly visible in the literature and terminology dedicated to that issue. Despite the fact that many linguistic works on homonyms and antonyms, large vocabularies in many languages have been dedicated, in most scientific-linguistic sources and specialized books, the problem of processing terms that are similar to each other and words that are confused in the language remains untouched. In the relevant German literature, we often come across terms such as paronymy, paronymic, and sometimes paronomasic or even paronomasia. For this lexical image, terms like "Doublette", "Doppelformen" or "Doppelbildung" (doublet words) are often used.

On the syntagmatic relations we can say that if paradigmatic relations show the systematicity of the lexicon, syntagmatic relations show the functionality of that system. In other words, syntagmatic relations indicate the combination of small lexical units into larger units. Syntagmatic relations are manifested as a result of the combination of words and phrases. Here we must touch on the concept of syntagm. Most linguists, after I.A. Beaudoin de Courtenay, understand the combination of any two language units when they say syntagm. For example, the word /Lehrer/ forms a syntagm by combining the root morpheme /Lehr/ with the suffix /-er/. L.B. Sherba (1974), disagreeing with his teacher, interprets the concept of syntagm in a broader sense and takes it as a phonetic whole, which has a specific meaning and is formed in the act of speaking, based on the grammatical rules of the language (Seyidov, 1992, pp. 290-299). For example, in the sentence /Birds sitting on the branches of the tree were chirping as if they were happy about the arrival of spring/, according to the classical approach, it is claimed that there are 9 syntagms for each number of words. According to L. B. Sherba and his followers, there are only 3 syntagms in this sentence, such as /Birds sitting on the branches of a tree/, /crying/, /as if they were happy about the arrival of spring//.

Thus, syntagmatic relations between lexemes are semantically and formally numbered and participate in the creation of larger sentences and texts. Semantically, the great linguist E. Coseriu (1967) calls the similarity the principle of lexical solidarity. Formally, the great Turkologist M. Kashgarli called it phonetic solidarity (synharmony). It is at the syntagmatic level that homonymy often occurs in sentences and combinations. For example, the phrase von Goethes Übersetzungen/ can be understood in two ways: /Goethe's own translations/ and /translations from Goethe/. Another example: the phrase /Tusi's portrait/ can be understood in three ways: /Tusi's picture/, /Tusi's reflection/, and /Tusi's picture/ etc.

In traditional linguistics, syntagmatic relations were divided into 3 parts. They included adjoining, reconciliation and management relationships. The approach of connecting two lexemes along a straight line is considered a very common connection. Adjoining is a rare occurrence in German. For example, /auf gut Glück/ (luckily) or /Auf Wiedersehen/ (good luck). However, in this language, the relation of agreement and control is widespread. In the phrase /Der fleißige Schüler/- /des fleißigen Schülers/, the adjective takes the appropriate case suffix along with the noun. In the sentence /Ich warte auf dich//, the object /auf/ is used in the Akk case by requiring the preposition of the verb /warten/. In German, the subject of the sentence must agree with the verb in quantity. For example, in the

sentence /Die Schüler singen ein schönes Lied//, since the subject is plural, the verb is also used in the plural. If the messenger is alone, the message will be alone. For example: /Der Schüler singt ein schönes Gedicht//. In linguistics, it is called redundancy. That is, the same sentence is repeated twice: /der Schüler+singular use of the verb/. This means that the singular and plural semi are repeated twice. This is called absolute iteration (Kobozeva, 2000, p. 187). This is sometimes called a pleonasm.

Finally, it should be noted that after O. Jespersen, it was distinguished nexus, junction and annexes among syntagmatic relations (Jespersen, 1958). For example, in the sentence /Der Hund bellt//, /bellt/ is an adnex. In the sentence /Der Hund bellt böse// there is a nexus and, in the combination, /Der böse bellende Hund// there is a junction. So, in O. Jespersen's theory, the verb is always adjunct. In addition, two types of adjuncts are distinguished in O. Jespersen: restrictive and non-restrictive. For example, in the utterance /die rote Rose/, the adjunct /rot/ is restrictive because it denotes a specific color to the exclusion of other colors. In contrast, in the combination /Liebe Anne/, /liebe/ does not limit the word it belongs to but is a bump.

CONCLUSIONS

Studying the structure of a language like German is crucial for gaining a deeper understanding of language functioning. German boasts a complex grammatical structure, featuring inflections in nouns, verbs, and adjectives that vary based on gender, number, case, time, mood, and more. Delving into these structures unveils linguistic patterns, elucidating how sentences are constructed and how words convey meaning in diverse contexts. This in-depth analysis not only simplifies the task of learning vocabulary, grammatical rules, and idiomatic expressions but also provides a richer and more meaningful comprehension of the language.

The emergence of new lexico-semantic variants leads to significant changes within the lexical fund of German language. The dynamics of the semantic structure of a single word determines the development of the vocabulary as a whole, its qualitative and quantitative transformation. Qualitatively, the composition of lexico-semantic groups becomes more complicated, new synonymic and antonymic relations develop, and the existing derivational connections of words are differentiated. In quantitative terms, the emergence of semantic neologisms is a powerful factor in the development of vocabulary, since the stems of words in new meanings are widely used in word formation to create new names. The conducted research and

the obtained results can play the role of a base for future scientific research in the relevant direction.

REFERENCES

- Askerova, K. (2014). Paronyms and their structural-semantic features in the modern German language [Dissertation submitted to obtain the Ph.D. degree in Philology]. Azerbaijan University of Languages.
- Azamatovna, B. S., & Salijanovna, I. S. (2020). Classification of could words in German and Uzbek. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(6), 7333-7339. https://eprajournals.com/jpanel/upload/1133pm_101.EPRA%20JOURNALS%201815.pdf
- Babenko, N. S. (2022). On the processes of some grammatical resources specialization in modern German language. *Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 16(1), 4-19. <https://doi.org/10.37892/2218-1393-2022-16-1-4-19>
- Bender, A., Beller, S., & Klauer, K. C. (2011). Grammatical Gender in German: A Case for Linguistic Relativity? *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 64(9), 1821-1835. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2011.582128>
- Brucher, L., Ugen, S., & Weth, C. (2020). The impact of syntactic and lexical trainings on capitalization of nouns in German in grade five. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 20, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2020.20.01.01>
- Bryant, L., Ferguson, A., & Spencer, E. (2016). Linguistic analysis of discourse in aphasia: A review of the literature. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 30(7), 489-518. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02699206.2016.1145740>
- Chavez, M. (2017). Hard Rules and Bad Memories: College Learners' Accounts of What Makes Learning German Grammar Difficult. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 50(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tger.12018>
- Coseriu, E. (1967). Lexikalische Solidaritäten. *Poetica*, 1, 293-303. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43028577>
- Dixon, R. M. W. (2021). The Essence of Linguistic Analysis: An Integrated Approach. Brill.
- Editors of Britannica Encyclopaedia. (2023). German language. *En Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/German-language>
- Elsen, H., & Kodantke, A. (2022). Neologisms from a lexicographic and lexicological Point of View An empirical Study. *MUTTERSPRACHE*, 132(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.53371/60326>
- Gardin, J.-C. (1973). Document analysis and linguistic theory. *Journal of Documentation*, 29(2), 137-168. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb026553>

- Glück, H. (2014). The History of German as a Foreign Language in Europe. *Language & History*, 57(1), 44-58. <https://doi.org/10.1179/1759753614Z.000000000026>
- Hopp, H., & Putnam, M. T. (2015). Syntactic restructuring in heritage grammars: Word order variation in Moundridge Schweitzer German. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 5(2), 180-214. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.5.2.02hop>
- Jespersen, O. (1958). *Philosophy of grammar*. Publishing House of Foreign Literature.
- Kaiser, I., Peyer, E., & Berthele, R. (2014). Does different mean difficult? Contrastivity and foreign language reading: Some data on reading in German. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 18(3), 222-243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006912440018>
- Kobozeva, I. M. (2000). *Linguistic semantics*. URSS Publishing House.
- Krongauz, M. A. (2005). *Semantics: Textbook for students of linguistic faculties of higher educational institutions*. Academy.
- Namer, F., & Hathout, N. (2020). ParaDis and Démonette – From Theory to Resources for Derivational Paradigms. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics*, 114(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.14712/00326585.001>
- Reformatsky, A. A. (2001). *Introduction to linguistics*. Aspect and Press.
- Sánchez Hernández, P. (2016). DICONALE: A Novel German-Spanish Onomasiological Lexicographical Model Involving Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic Information. *Education Sciences*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci6020017>
- Seyidov, Y. M. (1992). *Phrases in the Azerbaijani language*. BSU Publishing House.
- Shcherba, L. B. (1974). *Language system and speech activity*. Nauka.