

Language Interconnections And The Basic Units Of Language

Guzal Abdukhalimovna Rakhmatullaeva

Acting Associate docent of the Department of
«Russian Language and Literature» of Andizhan State University

Abstract: The article explores key aspects of linguistic relationships and basic language units from the perspective of systemic analysis. Special attention is given to three types of relationships: paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and hierarchical, which define the organization of language as a communicative system. Particular focus is placed on the interaction of invariants and variants, as well as the combinations of linguistic units in speech. The article presents a deep analysis of the mechanisms that ensure the integrity and functioning of the linguistic system. This approach allows for the identification of the structure of language based on invariants and variants of linguistic elements.

Keywords: linguistic relationships, basic language units, linguistic system, structural organization, paradigm, combinability, classification of linguistic elements.

Introduction

Systems analysis requires specification of language units and types of relations (connections) between them. When analyzing language and its levels, different language units are distinguished (phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, models of phrases, sentences), but the relations connecting these units can be generalized and typified. Specific language relations that determine the organization and functioning of language as a communicative sign system are relations. 1) paradigmatic; 2) syntagmatic; 3) hierarchical. Let us consider the nature of these relations.

Research Methods

The term "paradigm" has, like many other linguistic terms, two meanings. 1) A paradigm is understood as a set of variants inherent in an objectively existing language, permitted by the language system and structure, united by a common stable invariant, from which the speaker makes a choice at each stage of the communicative act [2, pp. 205, 218; 2-4; 6, p. 37]. This choice is determined not only and not so much by the desires of the native speaker, but above all by a) the language system, b) the goals of the communicative act and the limitations imposed by the "working" type of communication. 2) A paradigm is also understood as a classification of linguistic elements extracted from the speech chain. From the texts, based on the accepted criteria, linguistic elements are selected and classified (for example, by selecting, analyzing and classifying word forms [1, p. 216], paradigms of declension and conjugation are formed).

Results And Discussions

It is easy to see that the first understanding of the term "paradigm" allows us to distinguish a real object that is not directly observed in full in a single text, but exists, is localized in the brain and belongs to language as a sign system. The second understanding of the term "paradigm" allows us to distinguish a constructed object in its entirety, based on the implementation of the object's invariant in specific variants contained in the entire diversity of texts [7, p. 32]. In the second meaning, a paradigm is a certain "construct"*, which corresponds to a fragment of objective linguistic reality.

It is possible to come to the awareness, identification and recording of the "paradigm" in the first meaning of the term (as a real object that is not observed in full in a single text) by analyzing the diversity of texts and constructing the "paradigm" in the second meaning of the term, i.e., based on the classification of linguistic elements extracted from the speech chain. Paradigmatic relations can be defined as relations that actually exist in the language system, realizing the invariant of relevant linguistic units and corresponding to relations between referents and, consequently, relations between objects (in the broad sense) of objective reality. For example, the word forms house, houses, home... are united in the declension paradigm of the

word house. The paradigmatic relation linking the word forms: 1) implements the invariant "building for housing" of the class of units house, houses, 2) corresponds to the relations between referents, 3) really exists in the language system. Paradigmatic relations can be recorded - or not recorded - in the corresponding classifications, but are always "localized" in the consciousness of the native speaker and belong to the paradigm as a set of variants. We can talk about paradigmatics not only in vocabulary, but also at other language levels [4, 5, 9]. The term "syntagma" also has two meanings. 1) Syntagma as a set of potentially possible combinations of linguistic units in a speech chain, materially expressed: a) in the appearance of a linguistic unit of a certain class, b) in a change in the forms of a linguistic unit, c) in the order of arrangement of linguistic units, for example, words, d) with the help of the so-called auxiliary parts of speech, d) with the help of intonation in speech or punctuation marks in writing. Syntagma is determined by the grammatical system of the language, is realized in the speech chain and essentially depends on the position occupied by the linguistic element in the speech chain at a fixed point in time. Syntagma in the first meaning names a real object inherent in an objectively existing language, which is not observed in full in a single text, but is localized in the consciousness of a native speaker. 2) The term "syntagma" is also understood as a classification of the combinability properties of linguistic elements. By observing specific language texts, it is possible to identify the environments of language units (phonemes, morphemes, words, etc.) and thus construct a classification of the combinability properties of a language unit, ideally describing a language syntagma. This classification can be materially expressed, for example, in a set of grammatical models, according to which word combinations are constructed. Syntagmatic relations can be defined as relations between combinable language units in the process of speech activity in texts that are consistently developed in time. A special case of syntagmatic relations are syntactic connections - agreement, control and adjacency. Syntagmatic relations, which are given in direct observation in the process of speech activity, exist both in language and in speech. In language, syntagmatic relations are realized through the property of valence, which is understood as the potential syntagmatic properties of various linguistic units, and in speech – through the property of combinability, which is understood as the realization of potential syntagmatic properties (valences). It follows that in the first meaning, the term "syntagma" denotes the valences of linguistic units inherent in language [2, p. 210], in the second – their combinability properties observed in speech, based on valences.

Note that both paradigm and syntagma (in the first meaning) are inherent in language as an objective reality, and in the second meaning these terms are "constructs" fixed in scientific terms, but such "constructs" to which fragments of objective reality correspond. On the one hand, paradigm and syntagma in the second meaning are elements of description, objects of theory, invariants*, but, on the other hand, linguistic realities correspond to these elements of description (paradigm and syntagma in the first meaning). So-called hierarchical relations exist and are distinguished between linguistic units — relations of inclusion in a more complex unit. Hierarchical relations are based on two fundamental types of relations: relations of manifestation and relations of constitution. To characterize these relations, it is necessary to introduce the concept of a homogeneous unit of language. Homogeneous units of language are understood to be units that coincide in: material (in the sense of substantial) composition, in a set of relevant relations, in the function performed [14, p. 8]. For example, the words verb, adverb, pronoun, adjective, interjection are homogeneous units, because: 1) they materially consist of morphemes, 2) any of these words enters into a relevant relation "to be an element of a class" with the concept of "part of speech", 3) all the above-mentioned word-terms perform the function of nomination. The main properties of a linguistic unit are determined by its substantial essence, which can be described by a set of common, essential and distinctive features that allow us to differentiate this linguistic unit from other units. In language theory, the substantial essence of linguistic units is presented in the form of concepts-terms and their definitions.

The relation of manifestation (representation, realization) is understood as a relation, entering into which linguistic units realize their substantial essence in other linguistic units or in speech units. Let us consider the relations between the linguistic unit "phoneme", a specific phoneme |o| and allophones |ö|, |ō|. "Phoneme" is a short name for sets of phonemes [8, p. 35], an abstraction, and not a sensually perceived concrete object. V. M. Solntsev notes that "phoneme in general" acts as an invariant of the superclass of all individual phonemes [7, p. 36]. A phoneme, like a morpheme, word, sentence, is a unit of language insofar as units of language are "classes (sets of instances) of quite concrete and sensually perceived units" [7, p. 35]. The

"substantial essence" of the unit "phoneme" is determined by the fact that this unit integrates a class of specific phonemes united by the principle of homogeneity, i.e. coinciding in the set of differential features, the structure of relevant relations, and the function performed. "Phoneme" as an invariant realizes its substantial essence, i.e. is in the relation of manifestation to the classes of vowel and consonant phonemes; the latter, in turn, are in the relation of manifestation to specific vowel or consonant phonemes, and vowel or consonant phonemes are in the relation of manifestation to variants of phonemes, or allophones, actually existing in speech. The relation of manifestation is "inverse" to the relation "to be based on", since the substantial essence of language units is based on units of a hierarchically lower class (in language or speech). The relation of constitution is a relation entered into by linguistic units, as a result of which the composition of a hierarchically higher class of linguistic units is determined, for example, a class of words in relation to a class of morphemes, a class of models of phrases in relation to classes of words (lexemes) and specific grammatical categories. It is easy to see that the relations of manifestation and constitution are relations between classes of units, for example, classes of word usages, and individual instances of units, for example, a word-lexeme. The word-lexeme house is invariant in relation to the word usages house, houses, house... "A word in general", or "abstract word", is invariant in relation to individual instances of word-lexemes - house, table, chair... An invariant is understood as an abbreviated name of a class of relatively homogeneous objects [7, p. 35]. Thus, the word-lexeme house is an abbreviated name (or invariant) of the class of corresponding word usages, and "word in general" is an abbreviated name (or invariant) of the class of word-lexemes. In the material world there are no invariants, but "there are common properties of groups of objects, on the basis of which objects are grouped and displayed in a concept (meaning), called an invariant" [7, p. 32]. Does this mean that in language as a sign mechanism of communication there are no such linguistic units as "word-lexeme", "word in general", "morpheme", "phoneme", which are abstractions, and not sensually perceived objects?

Indeed, "no one has ever heard or pronounced a phoneme, morpheme, or word as such" [7, p. 34]. But these units of language represent sets of real phonemes, morphemes, and words, quite concrete and sensory-perceived units. The situation is complicated by the fact that a linguistic term ("phoneme," "morpheme," "word") designates both an abstraction ("phoneme, morpheme," "word" as an invariant) and classes of sensory-perceived units. It makes sense to introduce a distinction between the ontological and epistemological meanings of a word-term: the ontological meaning is a word as a sensory-perceived unit of language, the epistemological meaning is a word as an invariant, a scientific concept of a class of concrete words. When characterizing the relations of constitutivity and manifestation, it is also important to constantly stay within the framework of either the epistemological or ontological approach, without mixing them. Then the relations of manifestation and constitutivity in the ontological sense represent relations a) between classes of units ("word in general" — "word-lexeme"), b) between classes of units and individual instances of units ("word-lexeme" house — word usages of house, house...), and in the epistemological sense — between the corresponding scientific concepts expressing the substantial essence of linguistic units. Let us consider some relations that linguistic units enter into in the sentence (utterance) . The brick house stands by the road.

Paradigmatic relations: house — brick — relation "object" — "material of manufacture", house — stands — relation "subject" — "action", stands — by the road — relation "action" — "place of action". Depending on the communication goals, the speaker chooses from possible paradigms options that characterize a given communicative situation: brick, but not wooden, block..., stands, but does not rise, is located..., by the road, but not by the river, by the forest. The text implements lexical-semantic paradigms that belong to the language and are stored in the consciousness of the speaker - a native speaker. The speaker also makes a choice from declension paradigms (conjugation): brick, but not brick..., stands, but did not stand..., by the road, but not about the road. Syntagmatic relations: house - brick, stands - by the road - syntagmatic relations of agreement and control that implement the valencies of the noun house, the verb stand, the noun road, determined by the semantic and grammatical structure of the language. Relations of constituentness and manifestation: brick, road — the distinguished morphemes, uniting into a word, realize their substantial essence and form a unit of a higher linguistic level. The words brick, house, stand, road, according to known grammatical models, form a statement, realizing in the structure of the statement their substantial essence — the ability to nominate objects, phenomena, actions. The lexemes brick, house, stand, road are ontologically

short names of sets of real word usages, in the form of which they exist. Similarly, “word in general”, or “abstract word”, ontologically is a name of sets of real words, epistemologically — an invariant of really existing and observable real words of the language. “Invariants of all degrees are a kind of ideal superstructure, a reflection in human concepts of various, but quite real properties of a specific individual unit” [7, p. 37]. V. M. Solntsev emphasizes that “in reality, an abstract unit is derived from concrete ones as a mental object and that the statement about its manifestation is purely conditional” [13, p. 232].

Let us accept the definition of the function of language as “the practical manifestation of the essence of language, the realization of its purpose in the system of social phenomena, the specific action of language, determined by its very nature, without which language cannot exist, just as matter cannot exist without movement” [15].

Conclusion

By the basic unit (BU) of language we mean the main unit of language, which: a) enters into constituent relations with heterogeneous basic units; b) enters into paradigmatic and syntagmatic functional relations with homogeneous BU; c) carries out its manifestation in hierarchically lower BU or in speech units; d) determines the performance of one of the functions of language, ultimately communicative.

The specification of the concepts of “basic unit of language”, “linguistic relations”, the distinction between the ontological and epistemological understanding of abstract and concrete units of language will not only allow us to approach an adequate representation of the language system in theoretical linguistic models, but also to establish the semantic uniqueness of linguistic terminology, which fundamentally separates it from the terminology of other sciences.

References:

1. Бодуэн де Куртенэ И.А. Языковедение и язык: Исследования, замечания // Программы лекций. М.: Издательство ЛКИ, 2010
2. Березин Ф. М., Головин Б. И. Общее языкознание. М., 1979
3. Шмелев Д. Н. Очерки по семасиологии русского языка. М., 1964
4. Распопов И. П. Несколько замечаний о синтаксической парадигматике // ВЯ. 1969. № 4
5. Фурашов В. И. Проблемы второстепенных членов предложения и синтаксическая парадигматика // ВЯ. 1974. № 3
6. Панов М. В. О парадигматике и синтагматике /, ИАН СЛЯ. 1980. № 2.
7. Солнцев В. М. Вариативность как общее свойство языковой системы // ВЯ. 1984. № 2
8. Гипотеза в современной лингвистике. М., 1980
9. Головин Б. И. К вопросу о парадигматике и синтагматике на уровне морфологии и синтаксиса // Единицы разных уровней грамматического строя языка и их взаимодействие. М., 1969
10. Степанова М.Д., Хельбиг Г. Части речи и проблемы валентности в современном немецком языке. М., 1978
11. Helbig G., Schenkel W. Worterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Verber. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, 1973
12. Sommerfeldt K.Ë., Schreiber H. Worterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Adjektive. Leipzig, 1974
13. Солнцев В. М. Язык как системно-структурное образование. М., 1977.
14. Кобрин Р. Ю. О понятиях «терминология» и «терминологическая система» // НТИ. Сер. 2. 1981. № 8
15. Аврорин В. А. Проблемы изучения функциональной стороны языка. Л., 1975