



SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON THE LANGUAGE LEVEL AND ITS DESCRIPTION

Xayrullayev Xurshidjon Zayniyevich

Professor, Doctor of Philological sciences

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,

Head of the Department of Uzbek Language, Journalism and Computer Linguistics.

Samarkand, Uzbekistan.

Annotation: The work presents a kind of views on the definition of today about linguistic and speech units, therefore, it became necessary to determine the linguistic and speech levels. In the language, phoneme, morpheme and word are marked as the main linguistic units, and sentences, complex syntactic constructions and paragraphs are marked in speech. Based on this, phonemic, morphemic and vocabulary levels are put forward as a language level, and in speech - sentences, complex syntactic structures and definition of paragraph levels.

Key words: linguistic level, language, speech, linguistic and speech units, language and speech levels, phoneme, morpheme and word, phonemic level, morphemic level, speech level, sentence level, level of complex syntactic structures, paragraph level.

Although the language levels are interconnected, each of them requires relatively autonomous mechanisms that combine a macroparadigm of similar units. However, in real practice, these autonomous mechanism units must be included in the structure of larger autonomous mechanisms. In this process, they serve as building materials for the second level and its integrants. In other words, each autonomous mechanism unit forms the integration of language units at the level of a larger unit. For example, phonetic level units - phonemes - when included in the structure of a morphematic level unit - morpheme, form the integration of smaller units [4, P.146-147].

We observe such a relationship of language units not only within the framework of the phonemic, morphematic levels, but also in the interconnection of the morphematic and word levels, word and speech levels. This, in turn, indicates that the acquisition of functional value of language units is closely related to their mutual relationship. Language units are in three types of relationships: paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and hierarchical. However, each of these relationships has its own characteristics. If the paradigmatic relationship implies the relationship of language units within the level to which they belong, then the syntagmatic relationship reflects the connection of units of a certain level with each other within the second level. It is characteristic that only units belonging to a certain level can enter into a relationship. For example, a phoneme can be syntagmatically connected with a phoneme, a morpheme with a morpheme, or a word with a word. However, it should also be noted that the syntagmatic relationship leads to the formation of a hierarchical relationship. The point is that a phoneme cannot enter into a relationship with a phoneme or a morpheme with a morpheme within its own levels. For this, they need an object of application that constitutes a higher level than themselves. This also leads to the formation of an inter-level relationship, that is, a hierarchical relationship. Thus, syntagmatic and hierarchical relationships are inextricably linked. Language units can form a hierarchical relationship with a larger unit only if they are interconnected along a horizontal line. It should be emphasized that each level of language requires its own separate system. Their inclusion in the framework of hierarchical relations and their connection with other level units

expands the concept of the system and creates an idea of a holistic language system. This situation is observed not only in the relationship between units of language levels, but also in the connection of units of speech levels.

When considering the levels of speech, it should also be noted that this issue is only now being put on the research agenda in linguistic literature. Therefore, the issue of what to study as units of speech and what to recognize as levels that can meet this requirement has not yet been fully resolved. Of course, in this regard, the fact that until almost the present period of the development of linguistics, language and speech were not distinguished, and as a result, language problems were not studied in detail and special attention was not paid to issues related to speech, played a negative role.

We also observe this situation in Uzbek linguistics. H. Nematov and O. Bozorov quite rightly state the following: "Despite the fact that some ideas are being expressed in current Uzbek linguistics about the difference between dialectically related phenomena of language and speech, this issue has not been given sufficient attention so far. The fact that the approach of distinguishing between language and speech has not been taken as the basis for the study of the Uzbek language hinders a comprehensive and in-depth study of such issues as speech sounds and phonemes, phonetic and phonemic changes, lexemes, lexical and situational nominations, structures (models) and their emergence, the characteristics of lexical units in macro- and microtexts, and the essence and phenomenon at the syntactic level of the Uzbek language" [13, pp. 7-8].

At the same time, it should be emphasized that in the current period of development of linguistics, while fully recognizing the intrinsic connection between language and speech, it is also recognized that it is necessary and necessary to study them separately. As evidence of this, speech linguistics, albeit belatedly, is being scientifically substantiated as an independent direction of linguistics.

It is clear that the status of speech linguistics is inextricably linked to the requirements of the development of our science. The fact that our traditional linguistics is weak in the scientific substantiation of text linguistics and the interpretation of issues related to it does not require explanation. In addition, it became clear that speech is being studied as a purely linguistic unit also requires explanation. However, it would be absolutely wrong to conclude that speech linguistics takes precedence over language linguistics (linguistics of language and linguistics of speech). Speech linguistics is inextricably linked with language linguistics, which deals with the interpretation of issues related to units larger than language units and their levels. If we may say so, we can say that speech linguistics is a continuation of language linguistics. Therefore, the hierarchical relationship between language and speech units and the levels to which they belong operates in connection with each other. This can be easily observed both in the process of text segmentation and when we pay attention to the synthesis of text formation based on the inductive method. Thus, the study of language and speech units and levels separately does not deny the integral connection between language and speech, and this is not possible. The following remark by V.B. Kasevich, mentioned in this regard, is instructive: "It is necessary to study the levels of the language (language system) and the levels of speech activity separately. If the levels of language imply a specific system of order based on a hierarchical relationship with each other, then the level of speech activity is the "tact" of the activity of a certain language level in the process of sentence formation, or a separate stage of the application of the language mechanism" [7, P.21].

However, V.B. Kasevich emphasizes that speech and the level expressed by it also belong to language: "A fragment of information in its entirety cannot be expressed by units smaller than a language unit - speech" [7, P.21]. In our opinion, the expression of information by speech does not require its presence as a language unit, the expression of information is formed in speech, and the cognitive-communicative functions of language units intersect in it. V.B. Kasevich himself points out that the aforementioned idea was not stated in a concise conclusion and says:

“The issue of the number of levels of language and speech activity and their quality is still far from being definitively resolved” [7, P.24].

Indeed, the issue of speech levels still requires explanation in our linguistics. But we cannot say this about language levels. Because the number of units in a language should be the same. As for speech levels, no firm opinion has yet been expressed. Because the issue of speech units is still controversial. Therefore, it is difficult to compare the issues of studying language and speech levels with each other.

We have already mentioned that the phonemic, morphematic and word levels are formed in the language on the basis of units such as phoneme, morpheme and word. Among these levels, the word level is distinguished by its influence. The speech level, which is realized through its units, does not belong to the language, but to speech. However, V.M. Solntsev considers phraseological expressions and idioms to be out of the question here [18, P.18]. In our opinion, the issue of phraseological expressions and idioms requires clarification. True, most idioms and phrasemes cannot be called speech units; they are language units because they are already present in the system of our language. However, we would not be mistaken if we said that phrasemes in the speech pattern do not belong to the speech level (tier) of the syntactic structure. Of course, here too, the components of the phraseme are used in a transferable sense. However, this is related to the semantic aspect of the issue. From a syntactic point of view, this phrase can meet all the requirements of the speech level. The following opinion of M. Mirtojev is close to the truth: “Despite the fact that a phraseology is a compound or a speech pattern and has become a lexical whole, it retains its syntactic features. ... A phraseology is also a lexical unit. That is why this idea is put forward, putting it on a par with a word and acting as a part of a speech structure. This also includes phraseology with a compound pattern and a speech pattern. However, it should not be forgotten that a phraseology is only a semantic phenomenon. Therefore, although it causes semantic division in the structure of speech, it does not cause syntactic division” [12, P.187].

Indeed, the fact that a type of phraseological expressions is considered a stable word combination is of great importance from a purely semantic point of view. However, in their syntactic significance, we see the opposite. The evidence for our idea can be easily observed in the syntactic relationship of the components of phraseological expressions. In this context, it is appropriate to cite the following observation by Sh. Rakhmatullaev: “Syntactic analysis of the structure of a phrase is not an analysis of the structure of a speech unit, but of the structure of a language unit. In general, the syntactic connection between the words participating in the structure of a phrase retains its strength, does not die, but only becomes internal” [16, P.10].

Thus, we see that it is difficult to imagine the linguistic status of speech separately from speech. A word combination, although it is formed in speech, cannot be equated with it. First, it requires a constant derivational structure. Secondly, the components of a word combination are also considered components of speech in the structure of speech. This situation undoubtedly creates problems for studying the word combination as a speech unit and, at the same time, as a separate level of speech.

The second unit of speech is a complex syntactic structure. It can combine several sentences into its structure and form a hierarchical relationship with them. However, the study of the issue of complex syntactic structures (including traditional compound sentences) in our linguistics is still largely unexplained. Not only the term complex syntactic structure, but also the concept of a syntactic structure, called the term compound sentence, is interpreted differently by our linguists. Some linguists emphasized the need to completely abandon the concept of compound sentences (Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky, Sakulina, Kartsevsky, and others). For them, only the concept of (simple) sentences existed. However, according to I.F. Vardul, not all structures with complex structures can be interpreted as simple sentences. In addition, according to I.F. Vardul, syntactic structures traditionally called connected compound sentences cannot have the status of a sentence at all, while compound sentences with a subordinate clause have such a status. However,

since there is no connected compound sentence, there is no need for the concept of a compound sentence called a subordinate clause.

There are also other opinions and considerations on this issue. It is not possible to provide complete information about them in this work.

The largest unit of speech beyond the complex syntactic structure is the paragraph. Its status is primarily associated with its integrative nature, where independent sentences, parcellative and adjunctive structures, complex syntactic structures, etc. are used. L.G. Friedman also notes that the paragraph is a unit of speech and writes the following: "According to the communicative plan, the sentence is the main syntactic unit. The units of a higher level than this are the complex syntactic structure and the paragraph. If the sentence has been studied in all its aspects, the complex syntactic structure and the paragraph have not yet been studied at all" [21, P.155-156].

This observation by L.G. Friedman is, of course, reasonable. However, he includes only independent sentences in the list of components of a paragraph, while the complex syntactic structure and other syntactic structures are left out of consideration. However, in his above-mentioned opinion, we see that the complex syntactic structure is specifically emphasized as a speech unit. Since a complex syntactic structure is considered a speech unit, it also constitutes a separate level of speech after the sentence and, when used in the structure of a paragraph, enters into a hierarchical relationship with it.

It should be emphasized that the paragraph implies the highest level of speech and, since it includes independent statements and complex syntactic structures in its composition, acquires an integrative character. This is very important, the hierarchical relationship of speech units is inextricably linked with this characteristic of the paragraph. In addition, the expression of a complete message by a paragraph is also measured by its integrative character.

To date, each of the levels of language has been thoroughly studied, and fundamental research in this area has been carried out in world linguistics, including Uzbek linguistics. However, it goes without saying that linguistics, along with other disciplines, is always in development. This, in turn, requires not to be limited to the achievements achieved. This is natural, of course. Because the development of science requires a revision of our research, which is practically considered complete, and its replenishment with new information. When approached from this point of view, it is necessary to approach the interpretation of the issue of language levels and their specific linguistic nature using the latest achievements of our science.

Of course, the fact that each of the language levels is relatively independent in itself, and therefore they are considered separate objects of study, is fully recognized by our linguists, and no serious problems are observed in this regard. However, at the same time, the need to refer to other levels in order to interpret the linguistic nature of a certain level is, in our opinion, more obvious than anyone else to linguists conducting research in this area. It is no secret that in both secondary and higher education, information is provided that the phonetic level of the language is characterized by a set of speech sounds and such sounds are studied in phonetics, while the morphological level is characterized by a set of word forms and this issue is studied in morphology. However, it would be more appropriate to refer to the following extremely important ideas of Ferdinand de Saussure: "Morphology deals with the study of language forms, and phonetics with the study of sounds in the language. Such an approach is unsatisfactory not only from a theoretical but also from a practical point of view, since in most cases we find it difficult to determine which of the morphological and phonetic issues we are dealing with.

It seems that these considerations of F. de Saussure encourage us to reconsider our traditional conclusions that phonetics is the study of speech sounds, and morphology is the study of word forms. The following opinion of the scientist can serve as even more vivid evidence of this: "Morphology is the science that studies sound units that reflect certain meaningful parts and the interconnection of these units. Phonetics studies sound units that are distinguished by their physiological and acoustic characteristics" [19, P.70]. The most characteristic feature is that Saussure emphasizes the need to study phonetic units at the level of word form.

We also observe an opinion close to this opinion in W. von Humboldt [5, P.10-117]. The scientist emphasizes the need to refer to word form when describing or studying language sounds. The main reason for this is, of course, that the word consists of a sound and conceptual unity. It is noteworthy that Humboldt reminds us that in the early stages of language development, only stem units could be formed by sounds, and as evidence for this, he cites the use of stem units without the participation of affixes in ancient Sanskrit [5, pp. 90-91].

In addition to the above, the syntactic relationship of language units is characteristic not only for the syntactic level, but also for the morphological level. We can see the evidence of our idea in the syntactic relationship of language units existing at the word level.

References

1. Benveniste E. General Linguistics. - M.: Progress, 1974, 447 p.
2. Vardul I. F. Basics of Descriptive Linguistics (Syntax and Supra-Syntax). - M.: Science, 1977, 351 p.
3. Gleason G. Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics. - M.: Publ. of Foreign Literature, 1959, 485 p.
4. Golovin B. N. Language // General Linguistics. - M., 1979, (7-292), 415 p.
5. Humboldt V. von. Selected Works on Linguistics. - M., Progress, 1984, 397 p.
6. Jamolxonov H. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. – Toshkent: Talqin, 2005, 271 p.
7. Kasevich V.B. Elements of General Linguistics. – Moscow: Nauka, 1977, 182 p.
8. Klobukov E.V. The Role of the Universal-Logical Concept "Actant" in the Linguistic Categorization of Reality // Problems of the Cognitive and Functional Description of the Russian and Bulgarian Languages. Collection of articles. – Shumen, 2002 (Internet materials).
9. Letaeva L.A. Main Directions of Linguistic Research at the Turn of the 20th-21st Centuries (Brief Review) // Languages, Literatures, Issue 21. – Tyumen: State University, 2008 (Internet, 2008, Webmaster).
10. Martine A. Fundamentals of General Linguistics // New in Linguistics, issue 3, -M.: Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1963, (347-566), 566 p.
11. Matesius V. On the so-called actual segmentation of a sentence // Prague Linguistic Circle. - M.: Progress, 1967, (239-245), 559 p.
12. Mirtozhiev M.M. The meaning of words. -Tashkent: University, 2004, 222 p.
13. Nematov H., Bozorov O. Words and phrases. - Tashkent: Uqituvchi, 1993, 30 p. (Nematov H., Bozorov O. Til va nutq. – Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1993, 30 p.)
14. Novak L. Project of a new definition of phoneme//Prague linguistic circle. –M.: Progress, 1967, (95-99), 559 p.
15. Nurmanov A. Linguistics of the language// Uzbek language and linguistics, 2008, No. 6, 50-54 pages.
16. Rahmatullaev Sh. Uzbek linguistics of phraseology. – Tashkent: Uqituvchi, 1978, 405 pages.
17. Skalichka V. On the phonology of the languages of Central Europe // Prague linguistic circle. - M.: Progress, 1967, (84-87), 559 p.
18. Solntsev V. M. On the concept of the level of the language system // Voprosy yazykoznaniya, 1972, No. 3. pp. 3-19.
19. Saussure F. de. Notes on general linguistics. - M.: Progress, 1990, 275 p.
20. Trubetskoy N. Fundamentals of phonology. - M.: Publ. of foreign literature, 1960, 372 p.
21. Friedman L. G. On the study of the paragraph as a syntactic unit (based on German material) // Language levels and their interaction. - M.: Publ. MGPIYA, 1967, (155-156), 182 p.
22. Khayrullayev H. On the Peculiarities of Studying the Object of Speech Linguistics. Foreign Philology: Language, Literature, Education. 2019. (2) (71), 17-20. https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/foreign_philology/article/view/921
23. Khayrullayev H. Z. On the Peculiarities of Studying the Object of Speech Linguistics // Nomzod. dissertation abstract. Tashkent. - 2001.