Hierarchic Relations of Language Units

Xayrullayev Xurshed Zayniyevich

Doctor of Science at Sam SIFL, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract: *This article is devoted to a hierarchical relationship of the language and speech. The author tries to realize the units of language and speech, distinguishing from each other. Also, the internal separation of the language and speech are investigated with the factice materials in the article.*

Keywords: Language, speech, hierarchy, phoneme, morpheme

1. Introduction

The concept of a hierarchical relationship is the reality of the linguistic and speech tiers and is inextricably linked with their linguistic nature, because the essence of the term hierarchy (level) finds its expression in the inter-tiered stratificative connection. In fact, linguistics is one. Therefore, from a fundamental point of view, all units, from phonemes to text, relate to the language. However, based on the Saussure dichotomy "language and speech", we rely on the internal separation of the "language and speech" type and therefore we study the units of language and speech, distinguishing from each other.

2. Materials and Methods

As it is important in research various methods of analyses, it has been used componential, lexico-semantic, descriptive methods of analysis in the article.

3. Results and Research and their Discussion

In the language system, the question of uniting the smallest units of the tier remains controversial to date. While some linguists in this sense use the concept of a "phonetic tier," others consider it inappropriate to use the concept of a "phonetic tier," while others deny the existence of such a tier. For example, S.D. Katsnelson denies the existence of tiers, or rather, their name [14,101].

In the studies of A.A. Reformatsky, the concept of the phonetic tier is used, while it is felt that the author is based on the ideas of Baudouin de Courtenay: "First you need to abandon the usual axiom that" words consist of sounds ", because this concept is absolutely incorrect. Because, firstly, the word consists of morphemes (even monomorphic words are no exception); secondly, morphemes are formed by means of phonemes rather than sounds. Sounds made in speech suggest phonemes, and phonemes are the building material for morphemes"[19,95].

The same is noted in the statements of H. Zhamolkhonov: "The phoneme is the smallest segment unit, which performs the function of distinguishing, differentiating meaning through the sound cover of words, morphemes and grammatical forms"[9,38].

Distinguishing the sound shell of a morpheme or a phoneme is not just a phonetic change. In this process, the phoneme discovers its differential features. Of course, such a property in modern Russian linguistics becomes important in the occurrence of a phonological phenomenon called internal hierarchical relations. In other words, such differential signs serve as the basis for the emergence of the so-called micro-tier differential sign level inside the phonemic tier.

Phonemes only within the phonemic tier enter into a paradigmatic relationship. They, composing the expression of the attribute of units from the phonemic tier to large tiers, enter into mutual syntagmatic relations. But tier relationships cannot acquire such a feature. For they find themselves in a circle, the blockade of hierarchical relations. For this reason, the relationship between phonemic and morphemic, morphemic and word tiers are established vertically [10, 16].

Clearly, a phoneme can act as the minimum segment of speech, pro-modem, and rhythmic accentuation means cannot perform such a function. In this respect, they can be compared with the differential features of phonemes. However, differential signs within the phonemic tier form internal hierarchical relationships. In the process of the emergence of internal hierarchical relations, the phoneme performs an integrative function [4, 41].

The relationship between the units of the phonemic tier with the units of the morphemic tier determines the entry of insignificant elements of the language into the tier of significant elements. In such a process, the unit of the phonemic tier of the phoneme, due to its differential characteristics, forms the sound shell of the morpheme and this serves to express the meaning.

Hierarchical relations occurring at the inter-tier level originate between the lower and morphemic tiers. As evidence, we pay attention to the sound features of the following morphemes: *-ning, -ni, -da, -dan.*

At the same time, affix morphemes with grammatical meanings of the endings of cases are on the face. As a part of the first morpheme, syntagmatic relations of phonemes *n, i, ng*, in the second *n,* i, in the third *d, a* and in the fourth d, a, n, are formed by means of the sound envelope of the morpheme, larger than the phoneme by the language unit distinguish morphemes each from friend. In addition, these phonemes actively work to form the meanings of these same

morphemes. This means that hierarchical relations arising between units of phonemic and morphemic levels are detected by means of differential signs (vowels-consonants) of phonemes, functional significance, which manifests itself in the formation of a meaningful sound shell, as well as meaning-forming syntagmatic connections.

According to the fair statement of V.M.Solntsev, the phoneme assumes an invariant abstract unit, and its specific use is an allophone. The difference between allophones and phonemes is their real application. This indicates that allophones are specific phonemes. The concepts of phoneme and allophone are associated with different designations of the same language unit[22,15]. Based on this, it is possible to prove how far from the truth the ideas of linguists that the background and phoneme, morph and morpheme should be studied as units of separate tiers. According to the American linguist S. Lem, backgrounds or allophones, morphs or allomorphs, in contrast to phonemes or morphemes, form separate language stratums (tiers)[12,20]. J. Treiger believes that the number of language stratums is 27. Thus, of course, the essence of this problem is not simplified, but complicated[23,24].

When viewed from the point of view of hierarchy, the phoneme lives inside the morpheme. In this process, the phenomenon of alternation of sounds can occur within the framework of phonemes. For example, we can observe this in the third morpheme in the composition of the word *tinchligimiz*. In this case, the phoneme -*k* is replaced by the phoneme -*g* at the level of the morpheme - lik. A similar phenomenon is found in the example of phonemes: q-g': o'rtoq – o'rtog'i, soliq – solig'i, qiziq – qizig'i. In addition, the same replacements occur between the sounds g'g' –qq (bog'ga – boqqa, yog'ga – yoqqa), gg – kk (bargga – barkka, eggan – ekkan)[17,21].

According to A. Nurmonov, in this case various variants (morphs) of the morpheme corresponding to different situations are formed. In this sense, the replacement of sounds does not perform any phonological function[17, 21], and for this reason, there is no scientific justification for studying this phenomenon in phonology, since, in this case, it is necessary to study the phonological units of a language from a morphological point of view. For these reasons, the concept of morphology was introduced into the everyday life of the science of linguistics. One of its founders is considered N.S. Trubetskoy, who calls morphology (or morphophonology) a specific branch of grammar that studies the problems associated with the use of phonological tools for morphological purposes[24,115-118].

E. Kurilovich completely denies the concept of morphology [11,169] according to T. Ya. Elizarenkova, the idea of the concept of morphology A. A. Reformatsky seems reasonable [6,99].

A.A. Reformatsky, arguing about morphology, admits that it can receive the status of a separate branch of linguistics. At the same time, the existence of a connection between phonology and morphology is mentioned, and with them also between morphology. Despite this, A. Reformatsky notes that morphology cannot have an independent status of

the language tier, the main characteristic of which is the absence of its own unit [18, 99].

Indeed, the term "morpheme" is very difficult to become a unit of morphology. Because the phoneme is considered a phonological unit, and the morpheme is morphological. It is impossible, artificially combining them, to invent a hybrid unit of language. The following words of A. Abduazizov can serve as proof of this: "... morphology is not included in either grammar or phonology, but it uses the phoneme and morpheme that are their units ... Since morphology does not have its own unit, it studies phonological changes that are not related to phonetic state in morphemes"[1,70]. In order to proof, A. Abduazizov gives the following examples: bu kun – bugun, past – pasaymoқ, ong – angla, tara – taroq, o'qi – o'quv; qorin– qorni, og'iz-og'zi, etc[1,70].

In the present work, we considered the concept of morpheme on the basis of the following judgments of A. Abduazizov about this: "a morpheme is a group of altering phonemes participating in morphological alternations expressing the morphological significance arising from the combination of root and affix morphemes. A morpheme is considered to be a combination of several phonemes that perform a morphological function: ang-la - ong, tara - taroq, sez – ses/kanmoq, son - san/a, to's – to'g'on, qara-qaro-v - qarovul ... etc"[2,92-93].

In our opinion, the phonological changes that should be studied by morphology affect the structural features of the morpheme, but this does not affect the formation of hierarchical relations between the phonemic and morphematic tiers. In other words, changes in the syntagmatic relations of phonemes within the framework of the morpheme or the use of the opposite allophone in speech instead of a specific phoneme has nothing to do with the hierarchical relationships of units of the phonemic and morphematic tiers. For example: o'tgan – o'tkan, tara – taroq, burun – burnim.

The morpheme serves not only to ensure its functional activity, but also to the formation and functional significance of the word. The word consists of this small significant unit of language, as a result of which a new unit arises, which differs radically from the morpheme.

Morpheme is the smallest unit of morphology. In the words of R. Jacobson, the morpheme is considered the minimum significant abstract unit of grammar [16,210]. Thanks to this particular feature, the morpheme is very different from the word, with the participation of which the word with ontological meaning is created. Arguing, on this occasion, Yu. Naida, points out that it is impossible to characterize any phenomenon of the language without the participation of others, and this, in turn, shows that it is difficult to study each phonemic, morphological and syntactic phenomenon without one another, because language does not imply separate structures from one another. It consists of a functional whole [15,2-3]. In descriptive linguistics, serious attention is paid to the problem of the dependence of the manifestation of each tier on the units of the previous tier. According to her, it is especially noted that the morphemic

tier should be interpreted in terms of the phonemic tier, and the word tier in terms of the morphemic [5,53].

N.D. Arutyunova does not positively assess the concept of morph (a), which was introduced by descriptivists'[3,71-99], and she also opposes the existing linguistics judgments that the morpheme consists of phonemes. According to her, the phonemic tier cannot appear before the morphematic tier in the horizontal language model. The concept of "consists of ..." therefore can not characterize the relationship of the phoneme with the morpheme [3,88].

In the studies of M.M.Gukhman, as you can see, the main attention is paid to the issues of hierarchical relations between the word and the morpheme. M.M.Gukhman is trying to highlight this issue on the basis of the material of the morph and the form of the word.

In most cases, the word can be used as the root morpheme. In such cases, the hierarchical relationship between the morpheme and the word seems abstract. However, with a more serious approach to the essence of the issue, we observe how a full hierarchical relationship is currently being formed between the morpheme and the word. On this occasion, S. Usmonov's opinion seems justified: "A morpheme cannot be equal to a word. For example, the morpheme *kel* in the Uzbek word *keltirilmadi,* which squeezes the true lexical meaning of the word, cannot be semantically and grammatically equalized to the word *kel*. The word *kel* is full, grammatically complete, requires a subject of action in the II person, while the morpheme *kel* in the word *keltirilmadi* does not have meaning either a person or a number"[25,18]. For example, we pay attention to the linguistic state of the word *bakht*. At the moment, this morpheme fully meets the requirements of the root morpheme, because it cannot be divided into semantic parts. However, at the same time, it has the status of a word. This means that each of these two concepts is considered to be a unit of individual tiers of the language.

Undoubtedly, word components are considered morphemes that make up its structural forms [7,7]. However, some morphemes are equal in form to the word. Among them are the post-syllables expressing the grammatical meaning and alliances, the root morphemes used as a word. In such a situation, these elements can simultaneously combine both a word and a morpheme. So A.S. Gerd asserts about this: "the use of words in the language both as a morpheme and as a word cannot be the cause of any problem. For as there are morphemes consisting of one morpheme, there are also words that consist of one word"[7,9].

B.S. Haimovich, discussing word morphemes, both for him and E. Kurilovich, arguing that at the moment there is an intermediate unit, which is one of a kind, the content is different [8,161]. Indeed, morphemes that predefines words, in form appearing as morphemes, and in content appearing as words in their role. The order of use of morphemes is determined in relation to the root. In such a process, the importance of acquired distributional relationships of morphemes is important.

For example, when using allomorphs *-ka, -qa* morphemes *-ga,* the participation of allomorphs at the word level is subject to an additional distribution rule. For instead of one of them used in one environment, another cannot be used: *bargga, bug'ga, tokka, yo'lakka, qishloqqa, buyruqqa,* etc. In some cases, word-level morphemes are replaced. In such a situation, they are active under the influence of the distribution of free substitutions: *moshdek - moshday, odamday - odamdek, zich-lan-moq, zich-lash-moq, non-paz - nov-voy,* etc. Morphemes affected by contrast distribution with respect to the root, appearing in the same environment, express different meanings: *maktab-ga, maktab-da, maktab-dan,* etc.

So, we can define hierarchical relations between a morpheme and a word within the framework of a word. Moreover, the place occupied by each morpheme in this object, which is part of the word tier, is important.

The word is considered an object that serves for the real use of units of the phonemic and morphematic layers, as well as the implementation of the formation of hierarchical relations of small units of the language. This, in turn, indicates that it is the boundary between small and large hierarchical relationships.

The word, in contrast to the phoneme and morpheme, is the basic unit with its status both in terms of the vocabulary of the language and grammatical [21,20]. In this regard, the statement of A. I. Smirnitsky is very remarkable: "from a lexical point of view, a word acquires arithmetic meaning. And with a grammatical one, it's significantly algebraic"[21,21]. At the same time, A.I.Smirnitsky means that arithmetic units have an exact value; algebraic units are relatively inaccurate. In fact, the word as part of the vocabulary has an exact expression. After acquiring a grammatical form, it takes on a different appearance.

The entry of a word into a sentence is also a very complex process, it, first of all, relies on the help of a lesser unit of language - morphemes, and thus the hierarchical relationship between the word and the sentence is formed.

When describing this issue, Andre Martine uses the term "moneme"[13,451]. A.Martine characterizes a moneme as the smallest unit of speech and divides it into three types:
1. An autonomous moneme.2. Functional Moneme. 3. Dependent or subordinate moneme.

An autonomous moneme transfers itself from language to speech and without the help of any other receives functional activity. Functional moneme associated with certain components of the phrase (utterance) and gives them speech activity. And the dependent moneme, in order to receive speech activity, obeys the functional moneme: for proof, we will look through the following example: *To'g'ri,u bizga yordam berdi.* At the same time, the word the *To'g'ri* - autonomous moneme, the words *u* and *yordam berdi*, as well as the affix *-ga* is functional moneme, and the word *biz* is dependent.

The hierarchical relationship between the word and the sentence, of course, is formed in the process of reuniting the

words with the sentence within the syntagmatic series. The applicative method has specific significance in organizing hierarchical relations of units of language tiers[20,8]. In this way, it is possible to demonstrate the entry into the relationship of not only words with words, but also with the sentence: Ikromjon uning oldidan chidi → Ikromjon uning oldidan ko'ngli xotirjam bo'lib chiqdi → Ikromjon uning oldidan ancha ko'ngli xotirjam bo'lib chiqdi. (S.Ahmad.Ufq).

In hierarchical relations of a word with a phrase, the components of combinations both from the speech point of view and grammatically are active, because free expressions are formed in speech. But it should be noted that in this paper we do not interpret the hierarchical relationship between the word and the phrase as a separate topic. The main reason for this is the generation of collocations in speech. If so, each component of the combination is considered part of the sentence, and also, like other words in the sentence, organizes hierarchical relationships along with other words: *O'sha kuni nogahon qo'lga tushib qolgan kuyov mehribon qaynotasi yonida namozgar paytigacha ketmon urdi (H.To'xtaboyev.Yillar va yo'llar).*

In the above sentence, the presence of such expressions as *o'sha kuni, qo'lga tushib qolmoq, mehribon qaynota, namozgar payti, ketmon urmoq* are evident. But, in our opinion, there is no need to study their hierarchical relations with the proposal. For each word that is part of these phrases independently forms a hierarchical relationship with the sentence. Set expressions are units of language and therefore direct hierarchical relations are formed between them and sentences. However, the sentence will have to be reasoned a little differently in the sentence. The fact is that, depending on the use of the whole sentence, this type of phraseological units may appear in hierarchical relations or each component in its own way may show syntactic activity: Onaxon chehrasi ochilib, Jo'raxonning ko'zlariga tikildi (Askar Muxtar. Singillar).

Conclusion

In the above example, the expression "chehrasi ochilmoq" was used as a sentence, it currently functions as a semi-predicative construction, and therefore, as we see in the expression, it enters into hierarchical relations with the sentence in which it participates. But in phraseological combinations used as sentences, the syntactic weight changes when used independently. In other words, in such situations, their components enter into hierarchical relations.

References

[1] Abduazızov A. Morfonologııa // Baskakov N.A., Sodıqov A.S., Abduazızov A.A. Umumıy tılshunoslık.–Toshkent: O'qıtuvchı, 1979, 190 b.
[2] Abduazızov A.A. O'zbek tılı fonologıyası va morfonologıyası. –Toshkent: O'qıtuvchı, 1992, 135 b.
[3] Aryutyınova N.D. O znachımıx edınıtsah yazika // Issledovanıya po obshey teorıı grammatıkı.–M., 1968, (58-116), 291s.
[4] Babayev I.A Fonetıcheskıe edınıtsy i ix termınologıcheskoe oboznachenıe I.A.Boduenom de Kurtene ı v sovremennoy lıngvıstıke// Boduen de Kurtene i sovremennaya lıngvıstıka.–Kazan: Izd. Kazansk. U.t., 1989, (40-42), 191 s.
[5] Bloch B. and Trager G. Outline of linguistic analysis.–Baltimore, 1942. -S.53.
[6] Elızarenkova T.Ya. O morfonologıı hındı (K postanovke problemy)// Voprosy yazikoznanıya 1988, №1. s. 69-81.
[7] Gerd A.S. Morfemıka v yeyo otnoshenıye k leksıkologıı // Voprosi yazikoznanıya, 1990, №5. s. 5-11.
[8] Haymovıch B.S. Urovnı yazika ı razdeli lıngvıstıkı // Urovnı yazika ı ıx vzaımodeystvıye.–M., 1967, (159-161), 182 s.
[9] Jamolxonov H. Hozirgio`zbek adabiytili. –Toshkent: Talqin, 2005, 271 b.
[10] Kolshanskıy G.V. Problemi stratıfıkatsıı yazika//Voprosi yazikoznanıya, 1968, №2. s. 14-19.
[11] Kurylowicz J. Phonologie und Morphonologie // PhonologieolerGegenwart, Wien, 1967.-S.169.
[12] Lamb S.M. Outline of the stratifictional grammar.-Washington, 1966.-P.20.
[13] Martıne A. Osnovi obshey lıngvıstıkı//Novoye v lıngvıstıke, vyp.Z,–M.: Izd. ınostr. lıteratura, 1963, (347-566), 566 s.
[14] Martynov V.V. Dva urovnya yazikovoy deystvıtelnostı ı dvoynoe chlenenıe yazika//Urovnı yazika ı ıx vzaımodeıstvıye.–M.:Izd. MGPIIIa, 1967, (101-103), 182 s.
[15] Nida E. Morphology: the descriptive analysis of words.2 ed. Ann Arbor, 1949.-P.2-3.
[16] Novak L. Osnovnaya edınıtsa grammatıcheskoy sıstemi ı tıpologıı yazika//Prajskıı lıngvıstıcheskıı krujok.–M.:Progress, 1967, (210-225), 559 s.
[17] Nurmonov A. O'zbek tılı fonologıyası va morfonologıyası.–Toshkent: O'qıtuvchı, 1990, 46 b.
[18] Reformatskıy A.A. Fonologıcheskıe etyudi. –M.:Nauka, 1975, 133 s.
[19] Reformatskıy A.A. O sootnoshenıı fonetıkı ı grammatıkı (morfologıı)//Voprosi grammatıcheskogo stroya.–M.:Izd.ANSSSR,1955, (92-112),480 s.
[20] Shaumyan S.K., Soboleva P.A. Osnovanıya porojdayushey grammatıkı russkogo yazika. –M.: Nauka, 1968, 374 s.
[21] Smırnıtskıy A.I. Leksıkologıya anglıyskogo yazika. –M.: Izd. lıt- ry na ın. yazykah, 1956, 260 s.
[22] Solntsev V.M. Oponıatıı urovnya yazikovoy sıstemi // Voprosi yazikoznanıya, 1972, №3.-S.15.
[23] Trager G.L. Lingvistecs is lingvistics.-Buffalo – New.York, 1963.-P.24.
[24] Trubetskoy N.S. Nekotoriye soobrajenıya otnosıtelno morfologıı// Prajskıı lıngvıstıcheskıy krujok.–M.:Progress, 1967, (15-18), 559 s.
[25] Usmonov S. O'zbek tılıda so'znıng morfologık tuzılıshı.-Toshkent, 2010, 310 b.

Author Profile

Xayrullayev Xurshed Zayniyevich received his degree of philology at Samarkand State University in 1992-1997, respectively. In 2001, he got his Ph.D. of uzbek language and in 2018 he defended DSc in the field of the theory of linguistics, Applied linguistics and Computer science.