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Abstract: This article presents the opinions about the interrelationship of language units, paradigmatic relations and syntactic relations, the role of these two relations in the introduction of language structure, paradigmatics and syntagmatics specific to all levels of language, the paradigmatics of dual-predicative units with adverbial subordinate clauses, paradigmatical segments of place, time, condition, reason, purpose, result, the degree-quantity, consessivity, and their differentiation on the basis of formal-grammatical (expressive) and semantic-significative signs, special characters that serve to distinguish parts from each other in the paradigm of the dual-predicate unit of subordinate sentences.
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INTRODUCTION

Nowadays the scientific work on complex sentences with subordinate clauses, which are complex syntactic units of syntactic layer, is a priority in modern linguistics. The study of stylistic-semantic features of subordinate clauses with dual-predicative units, their formal and semantic structure, means of forming parts of subordinate sentences, problems of their formal-semantic features, as well
as factors describing the linguistic features of subordinate clauses are considered actual problems in modern linguistics.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The interrelation of language units is based on a paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. The connection of language units according to such relations was recognized by the Russian linguist I.Krushevsky (1883) and the English scientist Leon Kalner (1892), however, a thorough study of these relations came out in 1916 with the publication “Course of General Linguistics” by F. de Saussure [4]. Instead of the term paradigmatic relation, F. de Saussure uses the term associative relation. The term “paradigm” was suggested by the Danish linguist L. Elmyslev [14].

These two relations in the interconnection of language units are the form that determines the functionality of the language structure.

An relation based on the mutuality of language units in the flow of speech forms the basis of a syntagmatic relationship. The paradigmatic relationship, on the other hand, is based on the interdependence of language units up to the level of speech.

These two relations, which exist in the linguistic system that serve to characterize language as a whole phenomenon, belong to language units and characterize language according to various aspects [15].

Language units are able to express meaning by means of the interaction of paradigmatics and syntagmatics, which is specific to all levels of language [3].

Paradigmatics and syntagmatics are distinct phenomena. F. de Saussure identifies three types of paradigmatic relations, relying on the grouping of language units on the basis of formal similarity, semantic similarity, and both formal and semantic similarity [21].

A paradigm is a set of options in all layers of a language system. The variants are grouped within an invariant unit that incorporates important features of the language-layer microsystem being studied. The invariant unit has two different characters known as the dominant concept and the paradigm member. The options
of the invariant member are actualized according to a certain demand in the speech process. The members of the paradigm are associated with an invariant language according to a certain commonality, however, it is contrasted with one or another of its different aspects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Given the above mentioned considerations, it can be said that the paradigm consists of a relations of units with both unifying and distinguishing features.

For example, dual-predicative units in the adverbial subordinate clauses are invariant members in the paradigm of dual-predicative units in the subordinate clauses. Dual-predicative units of place, time, condition, reason, purpose, result, the degree-quantity, consessivity are variant members of this paradigm.

1. Where there is an ideological vacuum, it is clear that a foreign ideology will dominate there. (A.Ibrohimov)
2. It is always when he wishes evil to you! (U. Hoshimov)
3. In which family where spiritual depression prevails, this idea also lives on. (T.Malik)
4. Etiquette is the ladder of the tower of greatness and exaltation, therefore all goals and destinations can be reached through it. (The Treasure of Meanings)
5. The father is ready for anything so that his children do not suffer. (From spoken discourse)
6. The snow is falling so fast that the trees on the side of the street are bent down as if they were bowing helplessly in the face of the inevitable judgment of nature. (U. Hoshimov)
7. No matter how much you exhort those who are discouraged, they will not listen. (Sufi Olloyor)
8. The more you honor and respect your parents, the sooner their prayers will be answered. (T.Malik)

All of the following dual-predicative units of subordinate clauses have the common denominator that they are dual-predicative units of adverbial subordinate
clauses. This is the unifying, similar, common aspect that causes the constituents of the paradigm to interact.

Alternatively, each constituent of this paradigm differs from each other on the basis of the following formal-grammatical (expression) and semantic-significative (content) characteristics, which determine the conflicting attitudes of the paradigm constituents.

1. The diversity of grammatical devices that subdue the subordinate predicative unit to the independent predicative unit, such as: *where* ... *there*, *when* ... *then*, *if*, *therefore*, *so that*, *how much* ... *that much*, *how much* ... *so much*;

2. Overt and covert application of conjunctions of dual-predicative units in adverbial subordinate clauses: in the 1st-, 4th-, 5th-, 6th-, 8th - dual-predicative units in subordinate clauses are overt; in the 2nd-, 3rd-, 7th- dual-predicative units in subordinate clauses are covert;

3. The order of the subordinate predicative unit and the independent predicative unit: - in the 1st-, 2nd-, 3rd-, 4th-, 5th-, 7th-, 8th- double-predicative units of subordinate sentences, the parts are positioned in the form of SPU + IPU; in the 6th-double-predicative unit of subordinate sentence, the parts are positioned in the form of IPU+SPU;

4. The semantic relations between the subordinate and the independent predicative units were expressed differently - *place*, *time*, *condition*, *cause*, *purpose*, *result*, *consessivity*, *degree-quantity*.

These are the signs that provide a contrastive, at the same time, distinguishing factor of the constituents of the paradigm of dual-predicative units in the adverbial subordinate sentences.

The syntagmatic relation consists of the direct relationship of language units within a segment chain [3]. A syntagmatic relation is also a phenomenon that applies to all level units, a set of rules that give rise to the interaction of language units in a speech flow. In dual-predicative and polypredicative units, the interconnection of structural parts forms a specific level of syntagmatic relations.
Paradigmatics and syntagmatics are phenomena that allow functional units to be distinguished from each other, which is explained by the nominative and communicative terms of language units.

The syntactic paradigm is the study of language as a whole, a system of syntactic layer units.

A number of research studies have been conducted in linguistics to study the problem of syntactic paradigm [7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19].

Sentence is the main object of study and unit of the syntactic paradigm [1]. One of the most important and exploratory issues of theoretical syntax is the problem of speech paradigm.

Linguists have different approaches to the question of which sign of a sentence is important in defining a syntactic paradigm. In particular, as a sentence paradigm, V.G. Admoni takes a typical system based on the grammatical and content aspects of sentences [2]. In interpreting the syntactic paradigm, N.Y. Shvedova approaches it as a system of forms of sentence [19]. The syntactic paradigm of speech is interpreted in transformational linguistics as the transformation of one syntactic structure into another syntactic structure while preserving its lexical structure and content [20]. N.N. Mateeva recognizes that speech is a complex phenomenon and describes the hypersyntactic paradigm as a hyperparadigm or paradigm of paradigms [12].

All research on the syntactic paradigm is related to the syntactic level of simple sentences.

The subordinate system of sentences of the syntactic paradigm has not escaped the attention of linguists either. The paradigm of dual-predicative units of subordinate sentences is as complex a phenomenon as the paradigm of simple sentences. In this regard, a number of studies have been conducted to determine the nature of the paradigm of dual-predicative units of subordinate sentences [10].

In interpreting the paradigm of dual-predicative units in the Russian language, L.Y. Maksimov follows the subordinate predicative unit and the
independent predicative unit to rely on the relationship of tense forms of verb predicates [4].

Based on the materials of the Tajik language, D.T.Tojiev explains the paradigm of dual-predicative units of subordinate sentences, along with the tense forms of the verbs, the means of connecting the parts of dual-predicative units of subordinate sentences, the order of placement of the subordinate predicative units and the independent predicative units, the intonation [17].

Z.A. Egorova analyzes the paradigm of dual-predicative units of subordinate sentences on the example of German language materials and explains their five-stage paradigm: by means of dual-predicative units of subordinate sentences, the purpose of the speaker (giving message, question, order), expressing the affirmation-denyal, the attitude of the speaker (modality), and her views on time and person-number forms [6].

In defining the paradigm of dual-predicative units of subordinate sentences, N.N.Mateeva bases the combination of subordinate predicative units and independent predicative units and explains the paradigm as an invariant unit based on the English material, showing the model of dual-predicative units of subordinate sentences [11].

A. Berdialiev explains the paradigm of subordinate sentences with two types - formal-structural (expression), semantic-significative (content) [5].

Based on the above, it can be said that the formal-structural paradigm of the paradigmatics of double-predicative units of subordinate sentence is based on the idea that the speaker relies on the purpose, expressing the affirmation-denyal, the attitude of the speaker (modality), and views on time and person-number forms.

The expressive, formal differences of the constituents of the interconnected paradigmatic relations form the basis of the formal-structural paradigm of complex sentences with subordinate clauses, and this is the aspect that differs from the semantic-significative paradigm of complex sentences with subordinate clauses. The order of placement of predicate units in the constituents of the formal-structural paradigm, which form the conjuctions, conjucting means, forms the formal-
grammatical side of the constituents in the paradigmatic relations and serves as the oppositional basis of the complex sentences with subordinate clauses. For example:

1. It has become clear that every Muslim who considers himself a believer must perform his duties in the neighborhood without deviating. (T.Malik)
2. Whoever sows enmity and hatred, he will surely be troubled. (Az Zamahshariy)
3. Whoever commits a sin against his friend, he is the one who blocks the way. (J.Rumi)
4. As you all know, elections are an expression of the will of the people, the main criterion of democracy. (Sh.Mirziyoev)
5. Whoever sows the seed of good, the affection is called evil in the end! (A.Oripov)
6. Whoever does not do good, let him refrain from doing evil. (From the "Treasure of Pearls")
7. Whoever is faithful, he will find the faith, and whoever hurts, he is the one who suffers. A good person will never see evil, and whoever is evil, he will find a recompense. (Bobur)

The following subordinate dual-predicative units given above are the units that are related to the paradigmatic relationship in the paradigm of the dual-predicative units with a reference part, and the constituents of this paradigm differ from each other formally-structurally, i.e. in the form of expression:

1) according to the presence of reference parts – the 1st- and 3rd dual-predicative units have one reference part, the 2nd-, 4th-, 5th-, 6th-, 7th dual-predicative units have two reference parts;

2) according to the morphological formation of the reference parts – who-he, whoever-he, who-that, who-himself;

3) according to the use of reference parts - the reference parts are overt in the 1st-, 2nd-, 3rd-, 5th-, 6th- dual-predicative units, the reference parts are covert in 4th- and 7th double-predicative units;
4) according to the syntactic function of the reference fragments - the reference fragments in dual-predicative units 1-, 2-, 3-, 4-, 5- and 7 are syntactically equal, ie the same (Subject + Subject), and in the 6th dual-predicative unit, the reference parts in the subordinate predicative unit and independent predicative unit are not syntactically equal in function (Object + Subject);

5) according to the independent predicative units defining the tense in relation to the moment of speech: in the 1st and 5th dual-predicative units - the past tense, in 3- and 4-dual predicative units- the present tense; in the 2nd, 6th and 7th dual-predicative units - the future tense;

6) according to the speaker's attitude (modality) to the action in the dual-predicative unit – in the 1st, 4th and 5th dual-predicative units - in the direction of execution + execution; in the 2nd-, 3rd-, and 7th dual-predicative units - conditional + execution; in the 6th dual-predicate unit, parts are condition + command-request mood.

7) according to the order of the parts of the dual-predicative units - in the order of the subordinate and independent predicative units, in the 2nd-, 3rd-, 5th-, 6th, 7th- dual-predicative units, the parts are positioned in the form of SPU + IPU; in the 1st and 4th-dual-predicative units, the parts are positioned in the form of IPU+SPU;

From the analysis we can see that in the paradigm of dual-predicative units with the subordinate clause, special characters serve to distinguish parts from each other participation of reference parts, morphological formation of reference parts, use of reference parts, syntactic function of reference parts, beginning, the expression of the tense of the predicative units, the attitude of the speaker to the action, and the order of the parts of the dual-predicative unit) ensures that the constituents of the paradigmatic relation enter into opposition.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, we can conclude from the analysis that in the above paradigm of noun subordinate clauses with the dual-predicative units, special characters (participation of reference parts, morphological formation of reference parts, use of
reference parts, syntactic function of reference parts, beginning, the expression of
the tense of the predicative units, the attitude of the speaker to the action, and the
order of the parts of the dual-predicative unit) ensures that the constituents of the
paradigmatic relation enter into opposition.

The characteristic feature of the semantic-significative (content) paradigm of
complex sentences with subordinate clauses is that they have two or more
signifiable planes of similar, identical syntactic constructions.

Phenomena such as polysemy in syntactic constructions, syntactic
homonymy, syntactic polyfunctionality, confusion of meanings, syntactic
amphibole are characteristic of the semantic-significative paradigm of complex
sentences with subordinate clauses. The phenomena of polysemy and syntactic
homonymy in syntactic constructions form the basis of the semantic-signifiable
paradigm of complex sentences with subordinate clauses.
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