

**COCOGNITIVE NATURE OF PARADOX: ALIGOLOGICAL (ILLUSIVE)  
LANGUAGE UNITS AND CONTRADICTION, PRESUMPTION, PRESUPPOSITION  
AND IMPLICATION**

***Xamidova Sevara Baxtiyorovna***

*Jizzakh State Pedagogical University*

*Head of the Department of Practical English Course*

***Ilyosov Umidjon Ilyos ugli***

*Jizzakh State Pedagogical University*

*Faculty of Philology Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literature*

*Student of group 744 – 22*

**PARADOKSNING KOGNITIV TABIATI: ALOGIK(MANTIQSIZ) TIL BIRLIKLARI  
VA ZIDDIYAT, PREZUMPSIYA, PRESUPPOZITSIYA VA IMPLIKATSIYA**

***Xamidova Sevara Baxtiyorovna***

*Jizzax davlat pedagogika universiteti*

*Ingliz tili amaliy kursi kafedrası mudiri*

***Ilyosov Umidjon Ilyos o'g'li***

*Jizzax davlat pedagogika Universiteti*

*Filologiya fakulteti Xorijiy tilva adabiyot fakulteti*

*744 – 22 – guruh talabasi*

**Annotatsiya:** Ushbu maqolada kognitiv paradigma va paradoks haqida tushunchalar haqida ma'lumotlar berilgan. Kognitiv paradigma, odamning o'z ichki strukturasi, tilning roli va kognitiv jarayonlarning paradoksni tushunishga olib kelishida ahamiyatli bo'lgan tuzilmalarni ko'rsatadi. Maqolada kognitiv dissonans, assotsiatsiya jarayonlari va paradoksning qarama-qarshi va qarama-qarshi assotsiativ mohiyati ham ta'riflangan. Paradoksni tushunish va uning kognitiv strukturasi haqida ma'lumotlar ham berilgan. Metafora va paradoks o'rtasidagi o'xshashliklar va farqlar ham belgilangan. Ushbu matn kognitiv paradigmaning muhim tushunchalarini o'z ichiga olgan bo'lib, ularni kognitiv lingvistika va filologik gerменевтика bilan bog'liq holda ta'riflar keltirilgan.

**Kalit so'zlar:** paradoks, kognitiv tilshunoslik, prezumpsiya, implikasiya, pragmatik prezumpsiya

**Аннотация:** В данной статье представлена информация о понятиях когнитивная парадигма и парадокс. Когнитивная парадигма указывает на важные структурные элементы внутренней структуры человека, роль языка и когнитивные процессы в понимании парадоксов. В тексте также дано определение когнитивного диссонанса, ассоциативных процессов и двусторонней ассоциативной природы парадокса. Также представлена информация о понимании парадокса и его когнитивной структуре. Были указаны сходства и различия между метафорой и парадоксом. Данный текст представляет важные концепции когнитивной парадигмы, объединяя их с когнитивной лингвистикой и филологической герменевтикой.

**Ключевые слова:** парадокс, когнитивная лингвистика, презумпция, импликация, прагматическая презумпция

**Abstract:** This article provides information about the concepts of cognitive paradigm and paradox. The cognitive paradigm points to important structural elements of a person's internal structure, the role of language, and cognitive processes in understanding paradoxes. The text also defines cognitive dissonance, associative processes, and the two-way associative nature of the

paradox. Information about understanding paradox and its cognitive structure is also provided. The similarities and differences between metaphor and paradox were pointed out. This text introduces important concepts of the cognitive paradigm, integrating them with cognitive linguistics and philological hermeneutics.

**Key words:** paradox, cognitive linguistics, presumption, implication, pragmatic presumption

Within the cognitive paradigm, the separation of the paradox structure is understood as a mechanism for conceptual modeling of reality. In cognitive linguistic studies, paradox began to be considered as a linguocognitive unit, the nature of which is understandable under the condition of a fundamentally new interpretation, an interpretation of the paradox, cognitive foundations. The new interpretation of the paradox is based on a fundamentally new understanding of the nature of thinking in the cognitive paradigm.

In cognitive studies, thinking, which previously had an abstract and logical nature, is now interpreted in connection with its figurative aspects as the most important elements of consciousness.

Cognitive science considers language as a source of information about the role of language in the conceptualization and categorization of the world by the structures of consciousness. According to J. Lakoff, there is nothing more fundamental for thinking than actions and speech. Categorization is the result of human experience and imagination, a combination of perception, motor activity and culture.

In accordance with the cognitive approach, the cognitive processes of perception, knowledge and understanding, the consideration of the deep structure of the paradox are of particular interest. All cognitive processes are, in one way or another, connected with consciousness, and recent research in the field of psychology shows that the human mind, its inner spiritual world, has paradoxical properties. The anatomical structure of the human mind is the basis of the paradox, which contains a logical contradiction, expressed in simultaneous affirmation and denial.

From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, the basis of the perception of the paradox is cognitive dissonance. A paradox arises from the opposition of two elements, which have something in common, that is, a structure is formed from two components, and the properties of one component are repeated in the other.

A paradox is a combination of two opposing contexts, which create a karma-resistance, that is, external contradictory concepts, internal unity. At the same time, in the works on paradox in the field of cognitive linguistics, it is noted that the contradictory and contradictory associative essence of the paradox is expressed not only in the mechanism of cognitive dissonance. The process of association plays an important role. Thanks to association, a person sees similarities and differences between heterogeneous signs and is able to combine opposing conceptual structures in one statement.

Recent studies in the field of cognitive linguistics speak directly about the processes taking place "now", they note the formation of "a new social reality in the dynamics of a complex society, built on the basis of the methodology of triad synthesis, reflected in the logic of mental synthesis".

In cognitive linguistics, synthesis reveals the logic of paradox and reveals truth, as a result of which synthesis suggests the inclusion of paradox in the mechanism of building the cognitive structure.

In philological hermeneutics, as in cognitive linguistics, the similarity of paradox and metaphor in their functioning is emphasized. S. Tice, L. Cohen and J. Mason attribute to the characteristics of metaphor its creative function, which consists in the possibility of creating new ways of seeing the world. Metaphor connects two separate signs or subject areas, works with values, and

explains the appearance or behavior of one object using the characteristics of the other. However, in the process of constructing meaning, metaphors create new representations based on traditional representations: for metaphor to work, it is necessary to use an established system of values, in which normative characteristics are questioned. Metaphor “hangs between similarity and difference”.

Paradox has such characteristics, there is no contradiction in the opinion that “it creates a new concept, breaks conventional stereotypes and questions knowledge based on generally accepted meanings.”

In cognitive linguistics, paradox is defined as a means of knowing objective existence, which, while expressing a “hidden place of truth”, performs a creative function. Paradox creates a clearer picture of the surrounding reality, combines two opposing contexts that are not related to each other. Like a metaphor, paradox can reflect the values of a social group, shape the perception of the world and serve as a means of obtaining new knowledge about the surrounding world.

In the research and descriptive literature devoted to paradox, paradoxicality, there is a discrepancy in the use of the concepts of paradox, contradiction and contradiction, which are not synonymous, but determine a specific area of activity of a particular linguistic phenomenon. It seems important to give a descriptive description of each concept and to establish clearly defined boundaries in terminological practice.

The definition of paradox shows that it is often associated with contradiction due to the possibility of its broad understanding, but we emphasize that paradox and contradiction are not synonymous concepts, since contradiction serves as the basis for the emergence of a paradox.

In a large encyclopedic dictionary, a contradiction is defined as follows - the presence of two statements (in reasoning, in a text, in a theory), one of which denies the other; the conjunction of these statements or the provability of their equivalence; in a broader sense - an assertion about the identity of clearly different objects. The contradiction (contradiction) indicates the logical distortion of the reasoning leading to it or the inconsistency of the premises on which this idea is based - this is often used to reduce the contradiction (contradiction) and refute it by indirect arguments.

Linguist V.Y. Propp noted that the contradiction lies “not in the object of laughter, not in its subject, but in some kind of relationship between them.” Thus, one pole of the contradiction (contradiction) is in the surrounding reality, and the other is in the reader. Propp speaks of the lack of correspondence between the “correct” (i.e., typified, stereotyped) ideas of the reader and the reality he observes.

In the “Course of Modern English Phraseology”, A.V. Kunin distinguishes the following types of contradiction:

- 1) logical contradiction, combining two mutually exclusive concepts
- 2) direct contradiction, in which a sign is put that is not inherent in the concept
- 3) absurd contradiction, combining concepts and signs from different areas.

When talking about paradox and contradiction, it should be noted that contradiction is not opposition, it is one of the ways to construct a paradox: “Nowadays all the married men live like bachelors and all the bachelors live like married men” [ O.Wilde. “The Picture of Dorian Gray” P.-183] (Nowadays all the married men live like bachelors and all the bachelors live like married men).

In our opinion, in the issue of the relationship of paradox and contradiction, it is appropriate to divide them into separate groups. As V.S.Bibler wrote, “the living water of paradox renews the creative power of consciousness, makes it possible to see the original antinomic hidden reserves of the subject of knowledge.”

When comparing the concepts of antinomy and paradox, it is worth noting that antinomy is a nominal contradiction inherent in the concept of metalanguage itself, while paradox is a kind of reasoning that is a pilgrimage to the opposite conclusion.

It should be noted that there is a tested criterion for distinguishing between paradox and antinomy. The “volume” of a paradoxical situation includes all problems that speak of the fundamental inconsistency of different levels of knowledge, for example: empirical and theoretical, rational and rational. “Paradoxicality” is the most generalized characteristic of inconsistency. In an antinomic situation, as a rule, the inconsistency between problematic theses of the same level, that is, thesis and antithesis, characterizes a situation that is not meaningful at this stage within the framework of theoretical or empirical knowledge.

Antinomies that appear in the language, as a rule, are considered as fundamentally discrete formations, they are associated with a certain verbal construction, it is difficult to say that they are an adequate expression of the continuity of the thought process. However, in the real language space this “inconvenience” rarely becomes a stumbling block, a fundamentally insurmountable step. We find confirmation of this in specific linguistic studies, for which the “language game” with antinomic problems turns out to be a very effective element of the formation and creation of meaning.

When interpreting antinomy, researchers use the theory of opposition of N.S. Trubesky, which distinguishes two groups in any opposition system: one-dimensional and multi-dimensional. In a one-dimensional opposition, the diametrically opposite signs that both members of the opposition possess are present only in two members of this opposition - in antonyms. In multidimensional oppositions, the set of common signs for comparison is wider and is not limited only to the members of this opposition, but also extends to other members of this system. L.A. Gruzberg notes in his work “Antinomy” that usually absolute opposites are compared, for example: internal integrity - inconsistency, diversity - uniformity, immutability - changeability, uniformity - uniqueness, limit - infinity.

Antinomy is usually understood as a set of two mutually contradictory statements about one object, each of which is true in relation to this object and each of which recognizes an equally reliable logical basis. Antinomic statements are the result of a separate understanding of reality and events, a separate view of the object and the world as a whole - unity, harmony of opposites, integrity are not only not destroyed, but, on the contrary, are ensured by the interaction of opposing components. In paradox, an unambiguous idea of the existence of a contradiction (contradiction) is not formed, and here it is necessary to sharply distinguish between a linguistic paradox in the text and a logical paradox. In the research of E.B. Temyannikova, a literary paradox “does not contain any logical contradiction (contradiction). In this case, reasoning is considered correct in its logical structure and content, correct in its content, and is considered a paradox only because it does not correspond to generally accepted views in appearance”.

A logical paradox contains an insoluble contradiction, while a literary paradox contains an apparent contradiction, that is, in a literary paradox the existence of a contradiction is actually denied. N.Y. Shpektorova’s point of view is different, she claims that “all types of paradoxes, including literary paradoxes, are based on contradiction”. Paradoxes within literary texts may seem like elements of an intuitive process of text construction, but an analysis of their content and structure allows us to identify a number of specific methods that are reflected in the relationships between elements, which objectively participate in this process and are reflected in the relationships between elements of paradox or paradoxical statements.

According to the linguist G.A. Shpektrova, paradox is on a par with alogical (illogical) combinations, which are “several sentences, or sentences that by their content contradict the

content of the previous one, completely exclude it.” Contradiction is a logical relationship between concepts, one of which is the negation of the other, and between them there cannot be a third, middle option: a logical relationship between two simple comparable propositions that cannot be true and false at the same time: the truth of one of them necessarily implies the falsehood of the other, or vice versa. Contradiction is realized through one or another method of connecting opposites. This applies both to content, and to language, and to internal relations in a language paradox. In this case, real objects with their properties and mental phenomena - mental images, concepts, words and their meanings - can act as opposites.

G.L. Tulchinsky's point of view on defining the boundaries of the above-mentioned concepts is close to ours: he writes that "The primary task is not to search for and eliminate paradoxes and contradictions, or rather not to solve them using special technical methods, but to try to "calmly" consider paradoxes, to determine their internal logic, mechanisms and principles. In other words, it is necessary to analyze how language creates contradictions." In other words, language creates contradictions, which are then realized in paradox.

In further studies of paradox, a parameter was identified that is characteristic of all forms of paradox - due to the lack of a single solution, paradox was included in the list of means of text decoration within the framework of speech theory, which in the Middle Ages amounted to a set of rules for writing prose and poetic works.

From the point of view of the influence of the paradoxical literary text on the construction of meanings, it is necessary to consider the linguistic nature of the phenomena of presumption [ A hypothesis based on probability or assumption, a fact that is considered legally correct until the opposite is proven <https://uz.wiktionary.org/wiki>

] and implication.

A number of researchers consider a paradox statement to be a semantic and pragmatic presumption or normative violation. In this regard, they argue that the semantic presumption must be false, and the violation of a false presumption gives a true, logically normal sentence, and therefore does not lead to a paradox. We encounter the idea that linguists of different languages have different opinions about the validity of the same presumption. In addition, it is necessary to take into account not only the meaning of the sentence, but also its specific use in speech.

According to the linguist B.A. Uspensky, “any paradox is a violation of this presumption.” Paradox is “a statement that contradicts some orthodox [Orthodox (Greek) — unwavering adherence to established rules and principles in some field. <https://milliycha.uz/ortodoksal/>]

] idea, which is naturally called a presumption”. In modern studies, in order to determine the presence of a paradox in a text, it is proposed to simplify the structure of the statement. The minimum linguistic unit that results from the transformation of the statement, containing a clear contradiction, is defined as a paradoxical presumption. A paradoxical presumption is a logical carrier of paradox, expressed as a simple or complex logical proposition. “Do not put off until tomorrow what can be done the day after tomorrow” is a violation of the linguistic presumption, in which the natural negation in the paradoxical statement is considered to be “put off tomorrow”, “do it today”.

Let us give examples of paradoxes that determine the presence of paradox in the context of a presumption statement.

*I adore political parties. They are the only place left to us where people don't talk politics. ( Men siyosiy partiyalarni yaxshi ko'raman. Bizda odamlar siyosat haqida gapirmaydigan yagona joy shu)*

*I love talking about nothing. It is the only thing I know anything about. ( Men hech narsa haqida gapirishni yaxshi ko'raman. Bu men biladigan yagona narsa)*

*A man who allows himself to be convinced by an argument is a thoroughly unreasonable person. ( O'zini argumentlar bilan ishonitirishga imkon beradigan odam mutlaqo aql bovar qilmaydigan odamdir.)*

*Nowadays, with our modern mania for morality, everyone has to pose as a paragon of purity, incorruptibility, and all the other seven deadly virtues and what is the result? ( Bugungi kunda, axloqqa bo'lgan zamonaviy tushunchamiz bilan har bir kishi poklik, halollik va boshqa barcha yetti o'lik fazilatni namuna sifatida ko'rsatishi kerak va natija nima?)*

In general, we can consider the semantic presumption in a paradox from the point of view of logical analysis:

Sentence A is a presumption of sentence B if the falsity of A leads to the semantic anomaly of B, or vice versa: if the truth of B is a necessary condition for the semantic normality of A.

The field of semantics includes language paradoxes, and the field of pragmatics includes speech paradoxes. The concept of pragmatic presumption helps to explain how a paradox denies and changes a generally accepted idea.

In determining a pragmatic presumption, the speech act is taken into account, in which the element of common knowledge of the speaker and the listener, the element of background knowledge, is involved.

Next, we will consider how the knowledge of a person affects the process of understanding a paradox, which is expressed in linguistics by the term presupposition, and also show the metafunction of this term in the analysis of the process of systematic thinking activity in a paradoxical text. To do this, let's consider the terminological definition of the concept of presupposition.

The concept of presupposition is included in philosophical logic. In practice, it was used by G. Frege [Friedrich Ludwig Gottlob Frege was a German philosopher, logician, and mathematician. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gottlob\\_Frege](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gottlob_Frege)], and later B. Russell [Bertrand Arthur William Russell, 3rd Earl Russell was a British mathematician, philosopher, and public intellectual. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bertrand\\_Russell](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bertrand_Russell)

], although they did not use the corresponding term. The term presupposition and its detailed definition were introduced by P. Støren. There are various definitions based on different properties of presupposition. As a generalized definition of presupposition, the following can be imagined: a presupposition is a propositional component of a statement such that its falsehood makes the statement inappropriate or anomalous. Also, a presupposition is understood as a condition that the possible world in which the statement is contained is responsible for the direct meaning of the statement.

There are three concepts of the term presupposition:

- A) the relationship between the type of speech act and the set of facts about the state of affairs
- B) the statement or its validity is a necessary condition for the validity (truth or falsity) of the assessment of another statement
- C) the relationship between the statement itself, expressed by the sentence, and various types of unacceptable actions and specific speech acts [Demyankov 1994].

There are logical, pragmatic and semantic presuppositions. The last type of presupposition is characteristic of paradoxical texts. Pragmatic presuppositions represent the conditions or contexts that must exist for a sentence to be understood in its "intended" sense (i.e., for the speaker's intention to convey the intended meaning to be realized).

Semantic presuppositions describe the relationship between a sentence and the thing it represents. This type is usually understood as abstracting from the pragmatic conditions of utterance and comprehension of a sentence. In particular, semantic presuppositions affect grammatical processes.

- 1) Like implicit meanings, presupposition refers to “hidden” parameters that are indirectly expressed. Presupposition is not the understood meaning, but the knowledge necessary to understand the meaning of the paradox (basic knowledge about the subject of speech).
- 2) Subtext plays an important role in understanding the meaning hidden in a paradoxical text. Drawing a line between implicit meaning and subtext is very difficult due to the vagueness of the definition of the latter. In linguistic literature, this category, for example, in Silman, is also called “the hidden meaning of an event or statement, not expressed in words”, as part of a work of art, or “deep meaning” and “meaning not deliberately expressed verbally by the author”.
- 3) The concept of implication is closely related to the concept of implication, which entered linguistics from logic along with the definition given to it in logic: “By implication is understood such a conditional statement, accepted, that is, a logical operation that connects two sentences into a complex statement with the help of a logical connection, which in ordinary language largely corresponds to “if ... then ...” [Kandakov, 1954:191].
- 4) Implicature (Latin connection) - implies, covers subtext, unexpressed, ambiguous, indirect “wrapped” meaning phenomena. Implicature of statements - a new statement formed from two initial statements: a premise and a conclusion, which is false only in cases where the premise is true and the conclusion is false.
- 5) Implication is considered as a method of organizing a text that leads to the growth and deepening, as well as the change of the semantic and emotional-psychological content of the message without increasing the length of the units of meaning organization.
- 6) A number of authors, using the terms implication and context as synonyms, interpret them as a linguistic environment of other words, sentences or messages as a whole, or as a “subjective situation common to speakers”. It should be noted here that a word, by its very nature, as an element of the lexical system of a specific language, cannot function independently. The word itself contains signs of entry into a higher level of language organization, namely in a sentence, and this “grammatical designation of a word is the most striking indicator of its two-way dependence in the language: on the one hand, on the other hand, on the grammatical structure of the sentence” [Kolshansky, 1984:39]. The literary text for this study arouses interest, its implicational saturation constitutes an integral essence. In understanding a paradox, the size and nature of what is understood depends on the recipient. If the recipient does not have the necessary knowledge or does not perceive the features of the meaning of the word, he may misunderstand the implicit information due to the lack of prior knowledge. If knowledge is not suitable for understanding, then activating existing knowledge in the process of understanding a literary text helps to understand the text more deeply.
- 7) In the process of studying works that in one way or another raise the issue of the mechanisms of creating language paradoxes, two groups were identified:
- 8) 1) Construction mechanisms that implement the technique of contradiction
- 9) 2) Component analysis group
- 10) The first group includes the following construction mechanisms:
- 11) 1) Such a combination of contradictions that form a whole, the elements of which in one way or another complement each other, enrich each other, change each other, give each other a new status.
- 12) 2) The use of one-sided presentation of the phenomenon to complement a phenomenon with its opposite to demonstrate its ineffectiveness
- 13)
- 14) Combining different natural realities
- 15) Combining real and imaginary to explain actions and phenomena that are undesirable or impossible in reality in order to confirm the opposite truth

16) Combining different interpretations of symbols, statements

The mechanisms of constructing paradoxes are most fully described in cognitive linguistics, since the structure of the paradox resembles the mental processes of consciousness. "The anatomical structure of human consciousness is the basis of the paradox, which includes the logical opposition expressed in the coexistence of affirmation and negation, the stated and the implied, the desired and the real" [Ibid., p. 10].

The contradictory and associative essence of the paradox as the creation of a contradiction (contradiction), that is, the unification of contexts with internal unity, is expressed not only in the mechanism of cognitive dissonance. Associativity plays an important role, since associations are inherent in the very nature of the paradox and are its inevitable feature. Associativity is understood as the potential and universal ability of lexical units to evoke associations in the minds of native speakers with the language system, the world of concepts, and the phenomena of surrounding reality.

Due to the associativity of the worldview, a person sees similarities or differences between heterogeneous denotations, which allows him to combine opposing conceptual structures within the framework of a single paradoxical statement.

To describe the mechanism of paradox construction, cognitive linguistics actively uses the logic of synthesis, considered on the basis of the triadic synthesis methodology, and reveals the mechanism of paradoxical synthesis, which ensures the integrity of the paradox as a linguocognitive phenomenon.

Paradox is studied in the form of a framed structure in accordance with cognitive linguistics using the method of cognitive modeling of paradoxical hyperstructures. The cognitive structure of the paradox is revealed through a framed analysis of the explicit and implicit structures of paradoxical synthesis. When two mutually exclusive propositions are combined on the basis of an association of theses, a hierarchical structure is built, consisting of at least one element, at the highest level of which a paradox of the final resultant type is placed, functioning as a whole.

The result of paradoxical synthesis is a paradox as a linguistic-cognitive phenomenon, and mutually contradictory theses are expressed by axioms in the paradoxical structure, for example: objective-predicative inconsistency in a paradoxical context.

The second group includes construction mechanisms used in the structural analysis of paradoxical statements.

1) Antinomic substitution of one of the components of the statement:

2) *The amount of women in London who flirt with their own husbands is perfectly scandalous. It looks so bad. It is simply washing one's clean linen in public.*<sup>1</sup> (Londonda erlari bilan nozkarashma qiladigan ayollar soni haddan tashqari ko'p. Bu juda yomon ko'rinadi. Bu shunchaki jamoat joylarida toza kiyimlarni yuvish demakdir.)

**to wash one's dirty linen in public**

1) Maqolning birinchi komponentini almashtirish:

*Fathers should be neither seen nor heard? That is the only proper basis for family life.*<sup>2</sup> (Otalarni ko'rmaslik va eshitmaslik kerakmi? Bu oilaviy hayot uchun yagona to'g'ri asosdir.)

**Children should be seen and not heard.** (Bolalarni ko'rish va eshitmaslik kerak)

2) Maqollarni o'zgartirish:

*Lord Henry had not come in. He was always late on principle, his principle being that punctuality is the thief of time.*<sup>3</sup> (Lord Genri hali kelgani yo'q. U hamma joyga kechikib borishni

<sup>1</sup> wilde- online-info. <https://www.wilde-online.info/the-importance-of-being-earnest-page5.html> I

<sup>2</sup> O.Wilde. The Wit of Oscar Wilde, 1969, P. 36

<sup>3</sup> O 'sha manba X bob

*o'ziga odat qilib olgan edi. Uning nazarida hamma ishini aniq vaqti – soatida qiladigan odam vaqtdan yutqazadi)*

**Procrastination is the thief of time.**( Kechiktirish - bu vaqtdan yutqazishdir)

3) Kommunikativ ibora birligini o'zgartirish:

*"You gallop with a loose rein."*

*"Pace gives life," was the riposte.*

*"I shall write it in my diary to-night."*

*"What?"*

*"That a burnt child loves the fire."*

*"I am not even singed. My wings are untouched."*

*"You use them for everything, except flight."*<sup>4</sup>

*"Siz b'shahgan jilov bilan chopysiz."*

*"Tezlik hayot beradi", deb javob berdi.*

— *Buni kechqurun kundaligimga yozaman.*

*"Nima?"*

*"Kuygan bola olovni yaxshi ko'radi."*

*"Men hatto yonmaganman. Mening qanotlarim buzilmagan».*

*"Siz ularni uchishdan tashqari hamma narsa uchun ishlatasiz."*

Burnt child dreads the fire.( Kuygan bola olovdan qo'rqadi)

To date, linguists have described a large number of linguistic devices for creating paradoxes. There are several groups of linguistic devices for creating paradoxes in relation to the structural levels of the language, which have been studied quite thoroughly.

1. Group of tools for creating paradoxes at the graphic level

1) Transposing word boundaries and using homophones:

*"If you step onto a plane and recognize a friend of yours named Jack, do not yell out "Hi, Jack!"*

2) Using an anogram, which is a word or phrase formed by rearranging the letters of a word or phrase

3) Using acronyms, which are words formed from the first letters of other words and are sometimes used as abbreviations

2. Group of tools for creating paradoxes at the phonological level

1) shifting stress and changing intonation

2) Paronomasia (paronomic attraction) deliberate approximation of words that have similar sounds

3) Malopropisms

4) Spoonerisms[ Спунеризация – английский черкови рухонийси according to the name New College (Oxford) Spooner (1844-1930), non-interpretative transfer of sounds, usually in the initial case.]

3. A group of means of creating paradoxes at the morphological level:

1) Affixation, that is, the use of individual morphemes to form new language units;

2) The use and semantic change of compound words: I should have been a country-western singer. After all, I'm older than most western countries;

3) With alliteration, the creation of a paradox is accompanied by unnecessary repetition of individual sounds, syllables, words: I brought a brick to break the window with. And a spare brick in case it's double-glazing. can be a double-glazed window)

4) Group of means of creating paradox at the lexical level:

1. Ways that help to completely reconsider the described object, to determine its adequacy (compatibility) with other subject-matter units: epithets and relational figures.

<sup>4</sup> O 'sha manba XVII bob

2. Polysemous words: There are only two kinds of pedestrians — the quick and the dead.
  3. Synonymy: I'm as pure as the driven slush.
  4. Substitution of expressions with similar or close meanings:
  5. Using allusions, their adequate interpretation requires additional cultural knowledge
  6. Paremiology [The word paremiology is derived from the Greek words "paronymia" (wisdom) and "logos" (science), and is a branch of linguistics that studies the system of wise expressions in a given language, such as proverbs, sayings, aphorisms fandır[<http://samxorfil.uz/yangilkar/paremiyalar-ing-turli-tizim-dagi-tillarda-umumiy-khususiyatlari>] or updating phraseological units: the use of a paremiological unit in an unexpected context, which is an inseparable stereotyped (molded) part of language consciousness, leads to the creation of a paradox: Where there's a will, there's a way to avoid lawyers' fees.
  5. Group of means of creating paradox at the syntactic level:
    - A) Asyndeton [The word asyndeton is derived from the Greek: ἀσύνδετον, "unconnected", and the connectors are deliberately omitted from a series of connected parts. For example, "I came, I saw, I conquered".]- Change is inevitable.... except from vending machines.
    - B) Ellipse
    - S) Syntactic teutonic
- The abundance of linguistic means of creating paradoxes allows us to speak about the variability of the manifestation of the category of artistic paradoxicality.

#### REFERENCES

1. Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary. Moscow, 1983.-447p.
2. Lacey A.R. A Dictionary of Philosophy-3rd edn, Department of Philosophy, King's College, University of London, 1996.- P.386 .
3. Abdurakhmonov H. Mahmudov N. Aesthetics of the Word. – Tashkent.: Fan, 1981.-P.38-37
4. Ziyovuddinova Sh. Poetics in the work of Abu Abdullah al-Khorezmiy "Mafatih al-Ulum". – Tashkent.: TDSHI, 2001.-P.57
5. Yuldashev M. Isakov Z. Khaydarov Sh. Linguistic analysis of the literary text. – Tashkent.: A. Navoi National Library of Uzbekistan Publishing House, 2010.- P.111
6. Yuldashev I. Mukhammedova S. Kholmonova Z. Majidova R. Sultonova Sh. // Textbook // Introduction to Linguistics (Introduction to Linguistics) – T.: "Barkamol fayz media", 2018. – P.328
7. Khamidova.S.B. Lexical problems in paradox translations//FARS International Journal of Education, Social Science and Humanities – Finland, 2022. Volume-10. Issue-12. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7477902>
8. Khamidova S.B. Linguistic features of paradoxes //Research And Education, ISSN: 2181-3191 Volume 2 | Issue 4 | 2023 Scientific Journal Impact Factor 2023: 5.789 <http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=22258.560-566>.
9. Khamidova S.B. Problems of Paradox Translation //Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal – Jizzakh, 2022. - No. 4. – P. 488-498 (Impact Factor (2022):6.704).
- 10.Khamidova S.B. Lexical, semantic and typological aspects of the translation //Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal – Jizzakh, 2022. - No. 3. – P. 119-132 (Impact Factor (2022):6.704).
- 11.Khamidova C.B. Progressive etymological features of the paradox// Bulletin of the Khorezm Mamun Academy – Khiva, 2021.- No. 8. –P.311-316