E-ISSN: 2997-9439
American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies
https://semantjournals.org/index.php/ AJEES

| Research Article

Check for updates

THE GRAMMATICAL SYSTEM OF LANGUAGE AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF PARTS OF SPEECH: SYNTAGMATIC AND PARADIGMATIC RELATIONS IN LINGUISTIC THEORY AND TRANSLATION

Akramova Takhmina Kamiljonovna [1]
PhD (Acting Associate Professor) "Silk Road" International University of Tourism and Cultural Heritage

Abstract: The article explores the grammatical framework of language as an integrated and hierarchically structured system and offers a detailed examination of the issue of parts-of-speech categorization in contemporary linguistics. The research confirms the need for a unified method that merges semantic, morphological, and syntactic criteria, placing special focus on syntactic function. Syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations receive significant focus as essential mechanisms of grammatical structure. The study further examines the difference between major and functional parts of speech, grammatical homonymy in contemporary English, and the effect of analytical language structure on translation. The findings are significant for theoretical linguistics, comparative grammar, and translation research.

Keywords: grammar, parts of speech, syntagmatic relations, paradigmatic relations, analytical language, translation theory.

This is an open-access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

1. Introduction

Grammar is a key element of the linguistic system, along with phonology and vocabulary. It offers the structural basis that allows language units to operate in communication. In the absence of grammar, lexical items cannot be arranged into meaningful statements that can express intricate concepts.

A highly debated topic in grammatical theory is how to categorize parts of speech. Although centuries of linguistic study have occurred, a universal classification system has yet to be established. This challenge stems from the intricate characteristics of linguistic elements, which simultaneously embody semantic, morphological, and syntactic traits. The issue is made more complex in analytical languages like English, where grammatical meanings are frequently conveyed through word order and function words instead of inflection.

The problem of classifying parts of speech is not just a theoretical matter. It holds considerable practical significance, especially in translation studies, where variations in grammatical frameworks necessitate meticulous functional examination and the application of grammatical modifications.

This article seeks to examine the grammatical framework of language, investigate methods of classifying parts of speech, analyze syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships, and assess the influence of grammatical elements on translation.

2. Materials and Methods

The research relies on a descriptive and theoretical linguistic framework. The subsequent techniques were utilized:

- Descriptive analysis, to investigate grammatical categories and structures;
- Comparative examination to compare various methods of parts-of-speech categorization;
- Analysis of distribution, adhering to the structuralist model suggested by Charles Fries;
- Functional analysis, to examine the functions of grammatical elements in communication;
- Contextual examination, to elucidate grammatical homonymy and translation occurrences.

The analysis encompasses instances from contemporary English along with classic texts in theoretical grammar and translation research.

3. Results

Sure! Please provide the text you would like me to paraphrase. The Linguistic Structure of Language

The examination verifies that grammar forms the foundational structure of the language system and acts as a bridge between language as an abstract construct and speech as its tangible expression. Grammar governs the creation of word forms, phrases, and sentences, facilitating the expression of grammatical meanings that are abstract, generalized, and systematic.

The meaning of grammar is fundamentally different from the meaning of vocabulary. Lexical meaning is specific and unique, whereas grammatical meaning conveys generalized relationships among linguistic elements, including tense, mood, quantity, person, and syntactic dependence. These meanings are manifested through grammatical categories and structures, which collectively construct the paradigmatic organization of language.

The findings indicate that grammar establishes the essential criteria for predicativity and communicative wholeness, converting individual lexical elements into coherent statements.

Categories of Speech and Classification Standards The research shows that no single standard can act as a universal foundation for categorizing parts of speech. Semantic criteria alone are inadequate because of the semantic overlap among categories, whereas morphological criteria face limitations in analytical languages that have diminished inflectional systems.

The most effective solution is a holistic strategy that incorporates:

- semantic traits (broadened significance),
- grammatical categories and forms (morphological characteristics),
- syntactic roles (allocation and compatibility).

The results indicate that the syntactic criterion is crucial, as it demonstrates how words operate in communication Key and Operational Parts of Speech Major parts of speech have their own distinct lexical meaning and syntactic independence. These consist of nouns, erbs, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, and adverbs. These categories constitute the semantic essence of statements and are defined by well-developed grammatical structures.

Functional parts of speech, including articles, prepositions, conjunctions, particles, and modal words, do not represent objects or actions. Their function is to convey grammatical and logical connections among important words. Though they hold no lexical significance, they are crucial for grammatical coherence.

The difference between these two categories is relative, as certain words can change roles based on context.

Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Connections

Syntagmatic relations reflect the sequential arrangement of linguistic units in spoken discourse and are characterized as relations in praesentia. Paradigmatic connections are present in the language system as absent relations, associating various grammatical forms of the same word.

The interplay of these relationships guarantees grammatical significance and enables speakers to choose suitable forms in conversation. Paradigmatic selections are manifested via syntagmatic

arrangements.

Grammatical Elements in Translation (Expanded)

The comprehensive analysis shows that variations in grammar among languages significantly influence the translation process. Translation involves more than merely substituting linguistic elements; it is a intricate process of communication between languages that necessitates the alignment of grammatical structures.

The findings indicate that formal correspondence alone cannot achieve grammatical equivalence. Translation is based on the principle of functional equivalence, which states that grammatical elements in the target language should fulfill the same communicative and syntactic roles as those in the source language.

In translations between synthetic and analytical languages, grammatical meanings shown by inflections in one language might be expressed through function words, word order, or analytical structures in another. This requires the application of grammatical alterations, which consist of:

- rearranging components of sentences,
- substitution of grammatical structures,
- inclusion of function words,
- elimination of unnecessary grammatical indicators.

The research additionally affirms the significance of syntagmatic and paradigmatic connections in translation. Options for paradigmatic choices in the source language do not always align with those in the target language, necessitating the translator to choose different grammatical tools according to the syntagmatic context.

Grammatical homonymy poses specific difficulties in translation, since form-identical structures can have various meanings. In these instances, precise translation can only be achieved by means of contextual and functional analysis.

The results indicate that a thorough comprehension of grammatical structure, parts-of speech categorization, and grammatical relationships is crucial for generating precise and functionally sufficient translations.

llustrative Samples of Grammatical and Translation Phenomena

1. **The same lexical unit may belong to different parts of speech depending on its syntactic position and function, which confirms the leading role of the syntactic criterion.**

Language	Sentence	Analysis
English	*Water is essential for life.*	*Water* functions as a **noun** (subject).
English	*They water the plants every day.*	*Water* functions as a **verb** (predicate).
Uzbek	*Suv hayot uchun zarur.*	Noun (*suv*).
Russian	*Вода необходима для жизни.*	Noun (*вода*).

This example demonstrates that formal coincidence does not determine grammatical status; syntactic function is decisive.

2. **Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Relations (Language vs. Speech) Paradigmatic set (in absentia):**

get – gets – got – getting – will get

Syntagmatic realization (in praesentia):

Sentence	Grammatical Meaning
He gets a letter.	Present tense
He got the letter.	Past tense
He will get the letter.	Future reference

The grammatical meaning of *got* is determined only within the syntagmatic structure, confirming the interaction between paradigmatic choice and syntagmatic realization.

3. **Grammatical Homonymy and Contextual Interpretation**

Sentence	Form	Interpretation
She asked a question.	*asked*	Past Simple
She has asked a question.	*asked*	Past Participle

Although the form is identical, grammatical meaning is determined by syntactic environment (*has + V3*), which is crucial for translation accuracy.

4. **Translation of Analytical vs. Synthetic Structures**

Differences in grammatical systems require functional, not formal, equivalence.

English	Uzbek	Russian
He has finished the work.	*U ishni tugatdi.*	*Он закончил работу.*

Analysis:
The English perfect form (*has finished*) expresses resultativity grammatically, while Uzbek and Russian convey the same meaning lexically and contextually, without an auxiliary verb. This illustrates grammatical transformation by **replacement**.

5. **Function Words and Translation Transformations**

English	Uzbek	Russian
She looked at him.	*U unga qaradi.*	*Она посмотрела на него.*

Analysis:
The English preposition *at* has no direct lexical equivalent in Uzbek and Russian and is rendered through case forms and verb semantics, demonstrating **omission and compensation**.

6. **Word Order as a Grammatical Marker**

Language	Sentence	Function
English	*The teacher praised the student.*	Subject–Verb–Object order determines roles
Russian	*Ученика похвалил учитель.*	Case endings determine roles
Uzbek	*O‘qituvchi talabani maqtadi.*	Postpositions and case markers

This example shows that English relies on syntagmatic order, while Uzbek and Russian use morphological markers, requiring **restructuring** in translation.

7. **Functional Words and Meaning Shift**

English	Function	Translation
I do agree with you.	Emphatic auxiliary	*Men siz bilan rostdan ham roziman. / Я действительно с вами согласен.*

The auxiliary *do* has no formal equivalent and is translated through adverbs, demonstrating **functional equivalence**.

The presented samples empirically confirm that:

1. Parts of speech are determined primarily by syntactic function.
2. Grammatical meaning arises from the interaction of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations.
3. Grammatical homonymy requires contextual analysis.
4. Translation demands functional rather than formal correspondence.
5. Grammatical transformations are essential for equivalence between analytical and synthetic languages.

4. Discussion

The results of this research validate the crucial role of grammar in the overall framework of language and endorse the perspective of grammar as an active system that bridges abstract linguistic possibilities with their expression in speech. The findings align with both classical and contemporary linguistic theories that highlight the systemic and functional aspects of grammatical structure (Bloch, 2000; Jespersen, 1924).

The examination of parts-of-speech categorization shows that ongoing discussions in theoretical grammar are still pertinent because of the intrinsic complexity of language elements. The limitations of solely semantic or solely morphological criteria noted in this study correspond with previous criticisms made within both structural and functional linguistic frameworks. The results specifically support the view that semantic similarities among categories and formal ambiguity in analytical languages require a multidimensional approach. The prominent role of syntactic criteria, emphasized in the findings, reinforces functional theories of grammar that focus on real usage and distribution rather than on abstract classification.

The analysis highlights the difference between important and functional parts of speech, supporting the notion that grammatical categories must be regarded in relation to their communicative roles. Although major parts of speech create the semantic foundation of statements, functional words serve as grammatical indicators that organize meaning and create connections among content words. The relative aspect of this opposition, demonstrated by functional changes in specific words, affirms the dynamic and adaptable nature of grammatical categories, a point highlighted in contemporary functional and cognitive grammar approaches.

Examining syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations offers deeper understanding of the processes by which grammatical meaning is created and understood. The findings show that these relationships are not separate but function in close interplay. Paradigmatic connections outline the spectrum of grammatical options present in the language system, whereas syntagmatic connections establish their manifestation in specific speech contexts. This exchange confirms the theoretical difference between language and speech and illustrates how grammatical selections are influenced by context.

The study on grammatical homonymy in contemporary English highlights the real-world implications of the language's analytical structure. The decrease in inflectional markers heightens the dependence on word order, function words, and context for distinguishing meaning. This finding aligns with typological research that characterizes English as a language where grammatical meaning is mainly conveyed through syntactic and distributional methods instead of morphological indicators. The existence of grammatical homonymy signifies not a shortcoming but a fundamental feature of the language.

From the viewpoint of translation studies, the results highlight the significance of grammatical analysis in attaining translation equivalence. The research confirms the concept of functional equivalence, which states that grammatical structures in the target language should serve the same communicative purpose as those in the source language, even when formal matching is not feasible. The need for grammatical transformations highlighted in the findings corresponds with recognized translation theories that perceive translation as a process of functional and systemic adaptation instead of mere formal substitution.

Moreover, the function of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships in translation underscores the intricacy of grammatical correspondence across languages. Grammatical form

paradigms frequently vary greatly between languages, necessitating that translators choose contextually suitable options according to syntagmatic limitations. This discovery highlights the significance of contextual and functional assessment in the training and practice of translators.

In general, the conversation validates that grammatical theory and translation studies are strongly linked. A thorough grasp of grammatical frameworks, parts-of-speech categorization, and grammatical connections improves both theoretical comprehension and practical use. The findings of this research enhance current debates in theoretical linguistics and offer a foundation for additional studies on grammar, typology, and translation

5. Conclusion

This study has shown that the grammatical system of language constitutes a cohesive, hierarchically structured framework that is essential for the operation of language as a medium of human communication. Grammar acts as the bridge between language as an abstract system of symbols and speech as its tangible expression, facilitating the conversion of lexical items into grammatically and communicatively full statements.

The examination of the parts-of-speech classification issue has validated that it cannot be addressed using a sole criterion. When used independently, semantic and morphological methods do not adequately address the multifunctionality and contextual variability of linguistic units, particularly in analytical languages like English. The research indicates that the most theoretically robust and practically viable solution is a holistic method that combines semantic, morphological, and syntactic features, with the syntactic criterion being the most prominent because it effectively represents how words operate in speech.

The analysis of major and functional parts of speech has shown their unique but interrelated functions in grammatical structure. Key parts of speech establish the semantic basis of a sentence through their standalone nominative meanings, whereas functional parts of speech provide grammatical unity and structural coherence by conveying relational and logical meanings. Simultaneously, the comparative aspect of this contrast and the functional flexibility of specific words highlight the adaptable nature of the grammatical structure.

A significant theoretical contribution of the research resides in examining syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships as essential processes that regulate grammatical meaning. Syntagmatic relationships, manifested in sequential speech patterns, and paradigmatic relationships, which exist within the language framework as collections of grammatical options, were demonstrated to be mutually reliant. Their engagement allows speakers to choose and implement suitable grammatical structures, thus connecting systemic possibilities with communicative expression.

The study of grammatical homonymy in contemporary English has additionally emphasized the effects of the language's analytical structure. The decrease of inflectional markers and the commonality of formally identical grammatical structures enhance the importance of context and syntactic setting in defining meaning. This discovery emphasizes the importance of contextual analysis in both linguistic studies and real-world language application.

From the viewpoint of translation studies, the research has shown that grammatical elements are critically significant in obtaining suitable and functionally equivalent translations. Variations in grammatical structures, especially between synthetic and analytical languages, render literal or formal equivalence inadequate. Instead, translation necessitates the implementation of functional equivalence and systematic grammatical changes, such as reordering, substitution, addition, and omission. The research indicated that effective translation relies on the translator's skill to understand grammatical meaning via syntagmatic context and to align paradigmatic options between languages.

To sum up, a thorough and methodical comprehension of the grammatical structure of language, the rules for classifying parts of speech, and the processes of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships is crucial not just for theoretical linguistics but also for contrastive

analysis and translation work. The findings of this study enhance the understanding of grammar as an evolving system and offer a robust theoretical basis for future research in grammar, typology, and translation theory..

REFERENCES

1. Akramova, T. (2025, May 14–17). The development of translation theory and the application of modern research methods to convey meanings, preserve original style and cultural contexts (based on the works of Edgar Allan Poe). In “Silk Road and the Turkic World: Language, Literature, Translation, and Gastronomic Tourism Integration” (pp. 211–221).
2. Akramova, T. (2025). Edgar Allan Poe – virtuoso of poetic harmony. Samarkand, Uzbekistan: Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation of the Republic of Uzbekistan; Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Language • Literature • Education- 2(95), 185–192.
3. Akramova, T. (2025). Expressive language of poetry as a means of artistic communication. Oak-Academia Open, 10(2), 6–10. https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.10.2025.11046
4. Akramova, T. (2025). A comparative study of Turkic literature and Edgar Allan Poe's stylistics. In International Turkish World Cultural Heritage and Transfer Symposium: Values, Language, Literature, History, Tourism (Pamukkale)
5. Abduvakhabova, U. (2025). PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE IN TEACHING ENGLISH. Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal, 6(01), 11–18. https://doi.org/10.37547/mesmj-V6-I1-02
6. Baymatova, M. A. Some Features of the Adaptation of English Loanwords in the Korean Language. Editorial Board / Editorial Committee. Editor-in-Chief, p. 114.
7. Bloch, M. Y. (2000). Theoretical grammar of the English language. Moscow, Russia: Higher School.
8. Bloch, B., & Trager, G. L. (1942). An introduction to linguistic analysis. Baltimore, MD: Linguistic Society of America.
9. Fries, C. C. (1952). The structure of English: An introduction to the construction of English sentences. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
10. Jespersen, O. (1924). The philosophy of grammar. London, England: George Allen & Unwin.
11. Komissarov, V. N. (1990). Theory of translation (linguistic aspects). Moscow, Russia: Higher School.
12. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London, England: Longman.
13. Saussure, F. de. (1959). Course in general linguistics (W. Baskin, Trans.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1916)
14. Smirnitsky, A. I. (1959). Morphology of the English language. Moscow, Russia: Foreign Languages Publishing House.
15. Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation (J. C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, Trans.). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins. (Original work published 1958)
16. Madina Yakubova. (2023). MODERN VARIANTS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND THEIR FEATURES. Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal, 4(03), 236–242. https://doi.org/10.37547/mesmj-V4-I3-32