

About the Relationship of Language Units

Hayrullaev Hurshidjon Zayniyevich

Doctor of Philology (DSc), Sam SIFL Head of Department Uzbek language and literature

Annotation: The article discusses some problematic and controversial issues related to the hierarchical relationship of language and speech units. The main provisions of the article reflect the author's specific approach to contradictory views on the naming of units considered as a unit of language, their essence and study in linguistics. It clarifies views on phonemes, morphemes, words and sentence.

Keywords: phoneme, morpheme, word, sentence, language, speech, language and speech units, hierarchical relations.

Speaking about linguistic and speech units and their description, it should be noted that the interaction of linguistic units, of course, is inextricably linked with their distributional characteristics. Naturally, the possible relationships between linguistic units in a given environment do not fit into the framework of the second environment. In this case, the combinatorial connection of linguistic units is important. However, regardless of their functional significance, they are interrelated, since the combinatorial approach of linguistic units embodies the essence of the entire system. In other words, it is clear that linguistic units cannot be used in isolation.

Combinatorial relationships in linguistic units are equally important in both the paradigmatic and syntagmatic lines. When sounds interact, not only the sequence of connections is important, but also the phenomenon of exchange: noumidlik (pessimism), tinchlik (peace), bug`doyzor (wheat field). In the first example, affix + stem + affix, in the second, the interrelation of morphemes in the form of stem + affix + affix, and in the third, the distributive compound morpheme -zor, is based on the exchange phenomenon, requires a combinatorial connection.

Such relations of linguistic elements form a syntagmatic connection in different micro- and macro-forms. Syntagmatic relations are observed at all levels, except for the phonemic, since linguistic units cannot enter into syntagmatic relations at the level to which they belong. Syntagmatic relationships at levels are formed between the small units that enter these levels.

But the issue of determining the levels remains problematic. There is no consensus on this matter. While some linguists (E. Benveniste) talk about phonemic, word and sentence levels, others (B.N. Golovin) note that language levels consist of phonemic, morphemic, word, word derivation, morphological and syntactic levels.

V.I. Kodukhov notes that the language has the following levels: phonetic-phonological, morpheme-morphological, syntactic, lexical-semantic. The scientist refers to the intermediate levels as morphological, word-formation and phrase logical levels [Kodukhov V.I., 137]

In the conception of Yu.S. Stepanov, the language level means that units of the same name must understand a certain part of the integral language system and, on this basis, determine phonemes, morphemes, words, phrases, and levels of sentence [Stepanov Yu.S., 218].

V.M. Solntsev means a set of units of the same type that do not have a hierarchical relationship with each other, but form such a relationship with units belonging to other levels. Complexes of such units are observed at the phonemic, morphemic and verbal levels [Solntsev V.M., 81].

ISSN 2792-1883 (online), Published in Volume: 12 for the month of December-2021

Copyright (c) 2021 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

In our opinion, all the opinions of the mentioned linguists seem to be scientifically substantiated. However, this can be seen even more clearly in the comments of V.M. Solntseva. Because we understand phonemes, morphemes and words as the basic units of the language.

It should be noted that in the current period of the development of linguistics, the fact that each of the language levels is relatively independent, and therefore they are considered separate objects of research, is fully understood by our linguists, and there are no serious problems in this. But at the same time, the need to turn to other levels to interpret the linguistic essence of one level or another, in our opinion, is most obvious only to linguists conducting research in this area.

The results of existing research show that each of the language levels is relatively independent. Only the paradigmatic relations of the obtained individual units of the level can be studied on the basis of the laws of this level. On the other hand, their syntagmatic and hierarchical relationships are difficult and impossible to study without reference to units of another level. Consequently, the interpretation of phenomena related to the phonemic level of the language cannot be carried out without the participation of units of the morpheme level, and, conversely, the study of units of the morpheme level cannot be carried out without the participation of units of the phonemic level.

The interaction of linguistic units is inextricably linked with their distributional properties. Possible relationships in a particular environment may not arise in the second environment, and other relationships may be observed. Therefore, the combinatorial approach of linguistic units is important. This constant importance of the connection in both the paradigmatic and syntagmatic lines. This, in turn, leads to the formation of hierarchical relationships between linguistic levels.

However, the views of linguists on the problem of language levels, in particular, in the field of their definition, still diverge. In some studies, language levels include phonemic, word and sentence levels, while in others they are interpreted through phonemic, morphemic, word, word derivation, morphological and syntactic levels. In addition, information is given about the existence of phonetic-phonological, morpheme morphological, syntactic and lexical-semantic levels. According to our view, the definition of the levels of the language should correspond to its units. The linguistic nature of units of the phonemic level is more clearly expressed at the level of a larger units - a morpheme (or word), where phonemes form syntagmatic relations with each other and at the same time serve to form a morpheme. In this process, two meaningless and meaningful units of language intersect.

The morpheme also requires an independent level as a subunit of language. However, some linguists like (V. Skalichka) considered that some is the smallest unit of grammar. In our opinion, it is difficult to encourage this idea. Because the concept of some cannot be a grammatical unit.

The basic unit of language is the word, because it is central to the mechanism of language (F. de Saussure). Terms such as lexeme, semantic seme, lexical morpheme, used by linguists instead of word concepts, also do not justify themselves in many respects.

The word is the main means of transferring linguistic units into a speech unit - the sentence level, because both phonemes and morphemes are activated at the word level and through it is transmitted into speech.

Sentence is a unit of speech. When used in real life, it forms an inextricable link with language units on the left and speech units on the right. However, in linguistic literature, there are cases when a sentence is described as a linguistic unit. Such considerations, in our opinion, are a serious interpretation. The fact that sentence is a unit of speech has been repeatedly mentioned by leading scientists. In particular, the linguistic foundations of speech linguistics today cannot be called controversial.

In our opinion, the status of the smallest unit of speech belongs to sentence. It is somewhat absurd to know that a word is compound (I mean free unions, fixed unions are, of course, a linguistic unit), even if they are formed in speech. The main reason for this is that each of the components of the phrase performs a separate function in the sentence as its parts, and they form the general syntactic form of the sentence. Its non-verbal appearance requires an abstract model [Turniyozov N. and a., 20].

It is also inappropriate to use a phrase as the building block of a sentence. Because it is formed in speech. In other words, a structure that did not yet exist before the speech process cannot be interpreted as the building material of a sentence. So, the building material of the sentence is the word.

The concept of hierarchical relationships is inextricably linked with the reality of language and speech levels and their linguistic nature the original meaning of the term "degree" is reflected in the stratification of connections between levels. In other words, the linguistic level requires a semantic layer, and the relationship between them is hierarchical.

It should be noted that the modern stage of development of our language shows that the concept of a level, which has a linguistic status, should be interpreted not only from the point of view of language, but also from the point of view of speech. This, in turn, indicates that the notion of an ordinary tier remains inexplicable. Linguistic sources use concepts such as phonetic level, phonological level, morphological level, syllable level, allophonic level. This level of interpretation of the concept of level serves not to concretize the essence of the issue, but to abstract it. However, all of these levels can be combined into a single concept of the phonemic level. Note that the concept of syntactic level is also studied from a linguistic point of view. If the basic unit of this level is speech, then its description as a language level, in our opinion, leads to various misunderstandings. In fact, linguistics is unique. Hence, in principle, all units, from phonemes to text, belong to the language. However, based on Saussure's dichotomy of "language and speech", we rely on an internal separation in the form of "language and speech" and therefore study the units of language and speech in different ways.

REFERENCES:

1. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: Прогресс, 1974, 447 с. (Benveniste E. General linguistics. - M.: Progress, 1974, 447 p.)
2. Головин Б.Н. Язык // Общее языкознание. – М.: Просвещение, 1979, (7-292), 415 с. (Golovin B.N. Language // General linguistics. - M.: Education, 1979, (7-292), 415 p.)
3. Кодухов В.И. Общее языкознание. – М., 1974. – С.137. (Kodukhov V.I. General linguistics. - M., 1974. -S. 137.)
4. Скаличка В. Грамматика венгерского языка // Пражский лингвистический кружок. – М.: Прогресс, 1967, (128-195), 559 с. (Skalichka V. On the grammar of the Hungarian language // Praisky linguistic circle. – М.: Progress, 1967, (128-195), 559 p.)
5. Солнцев В.М. Язык как системно-структурное образование. – М.: Наука, 1971, 292 с. (Solntsev V.M. Language as a system-structural formation. – М.: Nauka, 1971, 292 p.)
6. Соссюр Ф. де. Заметки по общей лингвистике. – М.: Прогресс, 1990, 275 с. (Saussure F. de. Notes on General Linguistics. - M.: Progress, 1990, 275 p.)
7. Соссюр Ф. де. Избранные труды по языкознанию. – М.: Прогресс, 1977, 695 с. (Saussure F. de. Selected Works on Linguistics. – М.: Progress, 1977, 695 p.)

8. Степанов Ю.С. Основы общего языкознания. – М.: Просвещение, 1975, 271 с. (Stepanov Yu.S. Foundations of a common language. – M.: Education, 1975, 271 p.)
9. Турниёзов Н., Турниёзов Б., Турниёзова Ш. Ўзбек тили деривацион синтаксиси. – Тошкент: Навруз, 2011, 164 б. (Turniyozov N., Turniyozov B., Turniyozova Sh. Syntax of the origin of the Uzbek language. – Tashkent: Navruz, 2011, 164 p.)