Types of Linguistic Units and Their Peculiarities

N. Djumayeva

Associate professor of the Department of English Linguistics

M. Abdurakhmonova

Master Student of the Department of English Linguistics

Abstract

This article reflects the linguistic unit, its types, methodology, discussion and results of scientists, and comments on the topic. The origin of this topic as a science, the history of science is discussed. Sources, ideas and examples of scientists who worked on the linguistic units of the language and its types are cited. Concepts and examples of lexeme, phoneme, morpheme, and phrase are given.

Keywords: Language, morpheme, lexeme, syntax, speech sound, suffix, phrase, phraseology.

INTRODUCTION

After the separation of linguistics from other disciplines, serious attention was paid to the distinction between language and speech. Differences between language and speech are found in Arab linguistics in the 8th-9th centuries, and then in the teachings of V. Humboldt, A. Shteinthal and B. Courtenay, representatives of linguistics in the 20s of the 20th century. But distinguishing language and speech from a scientific and practical point of view, interpreting them in a new context is related to the teachings of Ferdinand de Saussure and his followers. In the early years, the term "language" was used instead of "language" because this word caused a certain amount of confusion due to its ambiguous nature [1,58].

The term "language" refers to units prepared in advance for all members of society, which express a common, binding opinion for all, and the laws of mutual association of these units. Such a definition of language means that it embodies qualities such as generality, essence, possibility, reason, and it is a psychophysical phenomenon. From this point of view, language and speech have their own unique units. Conjugation rules and units are different in the language [2,115]. A linguistic unit is considered to be a whole of both sides:

a) the formal, i.e. external side of the linguistic unit;

b) the function, spiritual value of the linguistic unit;

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Linguistic unit is stored in the mind of this person as a certain symbol, scheme. For example, a common understanding and idea about the pronunciation aspects of the phoneme [a] is the same for all people who speak Uzbek. This is the outer side of the phoneme [a], and the inner side is made up of mutual meaning differentiation and demarcation aspects. First of all, the inside and outside are indistinguishable, but at the same time they are not the same. In the language-speech ability-speech chain, which is contradictory and interdependent, only speech is manifested in an external form, that is, in oral or written form. Language is always fed by people's thinking, and thinking, in turn, is fed by religion, nationality, and the environment [3,75]. Ferdinand de

Saussure explains the difference between language and speech based on the rules of the chess game. Chess pieces and the rules of their movement are similar to linguistic units in the human mind and the rules of their combination. The terms of the game are the same for everyone. A player is a speaker, and knowledge of the game of chess is similar to the ability to speak. Based on this, we can put our language-speech ability-speech trinity in the form of chess-playing ability-game.

Linguistic units: phoneme, morpheme, lexeme, phrase, pattern;

Speech units: speech sound, suffix, word, phrase, sentence;

If we approach language and speech units dialectically, language includes the characteristics of generality, essence, possibility and reason. Speech and its units have characteristics such as singularity, event, reality, consequence.

Linguistic units also belong to a certain linguistic level, they differ according to: phonetic, lexical, morphological, syntactic paradigm.

One of the main points of V. Humboldt's linguistic theory is the language form, i.e., the theory of language forms, in other words, the theory of the internal structure of the language. According to V. Humboldt's theory, language is a form, and he mentions several types of language forms. One of them is the formation of language forms from the sounds of speech, and another is the manifestation of the language form as a system, that is, each part or element of the language exists according to a certain element [4,103].

Ferdinand de Saussure approaches the theory of language from two different perspectives. On the one hand, language is a system of symbols. That is, the semiotic system or the semiological system as he called it. On the other hand, language is also a social phenomenon, a product of a language community. Saussure argues that language is a "social fact"; a set of conventional rules or norms associated with speech. When at least two people are in conversation, a communicative chain is formed between the minds of the individual speakers.

DISCUSSION

Language is an abstract phenomenon in the part of the human brain where language memory is fed by thinking. The existing events in the language are called linguistic units. The state of linguistic units formed as a result of the speech process is called speech units. In some literature, speech and language are considered as a dichotomy and opposition, in fact, it is wrong to talk about this, because language and speech are phenomena like the relationship of whole and part. It should be noted that the phenomenon that can be distinguished as an alternative to speech is not a language, but a language. Even though the phoneme, which is one of the linguistic units, is the smallest unit compared to other linguistic units of the language, it performs the biggest task [5,438]. In addition, other linguistic units are based on phonemes. The task of the phoneme is to create units that express meaning, such as morpheme, lexeme, and word, and to perform tasks such as forming them from the sound side and differentiating the sound side in its place. Phonemes, which are a minimal linguistic unit, are a general pattern of sound manifestations created by human speech organs, and live in our minds as a series of generalizations of infinite sounds. Based on these psycho-acoustic images in the minds of speakers, they create sounds by moving the organs of speech.

A lexeme differs from a phoneme and a morpheme in its overall dialectic, and is distinguished by certain characteristics. This linguistic unit is general when viewed as a linguistic event, and specific when viewed as a speech event. As a linguistic unit, a lexeme represents the integrity and unity of 2 parts that are organically connected.

Linguistic units have a certain relationship in the structure of the system. This relationship, in turn, is divided into 2 groups: a) mutual relationship of units belonging to the same level b) mutual relationship of units belonging to different levels, that is, it can be called inter-level relationship. At this point, the units involved in this relationship enter into 2 types of

relationships with each other: a) nesting b) sequential. Each lexeme also has a content as a linguistic unit. The content plan of lexemes refers to concepts that represent things, actions, signs, quantities, etc., which are called denotations or referents [6,224]. Based on this concept, a sememe (the meaning of a lexeme) is formed. Concept and meaning are not the same thing, they have different properties. For example, people who speak English, Russian, and German have the concepts of brother and sister. However, these concepts are united in one meaning (sememe) in the lexemes brother (English), brat (Russian). Or the lexemes [yuz], [bet], [bashara], [chehra], [oraz] represent the same concept, but their meanings differ from each other. The elements that make up a seme, which is a series of lexemes, are semes. Just as a nomeme is formed based on different combinations of sounds, a sememe with different content is formed based on different combinations of these semes and the exchange of some of them. The seminal composition of these semes is as follows: [face] - "human", "front of the head", "both sides of the nose", "from forehead to chin", "from nose to ear", "limited in application", "stylistically neutral", "pertaining to the Turkic layer", " general consumption". [jamal] - "characteristic of a person", "front of the head", "both sides of the nose", "from the forehead to the chin", "from the nose to the ear", "use is not limited", "characteristic of the artistic style", "characteristic of the Arab layer". Both lexemes represent the same concept. Their content plan - seminal content of their semes differs. Lexemes of lexemes represent the reflection of the denotation - the concept. Each lexeme seme has similar and different semes. Similar themes serve to unite them into groups, and different themes serve to separate them [7,95].

A morpheme is a small linguistic unit consisting of a unity of form and non-denotative content, which cannot express its essence separately from a lexeme. It, in turn, differs from the phoneme, which has a material base and building materials. The term morpheme was one of the first to be introduced by B. Courtenay and represents the smallest meaningful part of a word. Morphemes are a combination of content and expression. A morpheme appears in the word form as an allomorph and a morph. A morpheme also consists of the totality of external (material) and internal (meaning, task) aspects. These units, which do not have the independence of adjectives and an independent syntactic position, combine lexical and grammatical essences: a) create new words; b) gives additional lexical-semantic value to words.

The next type of linguistic units are devices - patterns. Patterns are made-up words, word combinations, and sentence formation schemes. Patterns are of two types: a) word formation patterns; b) syntactic (phrase and sentence) patterns. Patterns are limited in quantity, for example, in the Uzbek language, 18 priority patterns for forming word combinations are distinguished, and in our speech we create countless word combinations from them [8,119].

CONCLUSION

Linguistic unit - one of the natural units into which linguistic messages can be analyzed; elements that are uniform and indivisible from the standpoint of a certain level of text segmentation (phonological, morphological, etc.) and that are opposed to one another in the system corresponding to this level. The indivisibility of a linguistic unit must be interpreted as its inability to be broken down into smaller units of the same kind, yet this does not rule out the possibility that on a different level, a combination of units of "lower rank" may correspond to this unit. Thus, a word (or "lexeme" in some linguists' terminology) seen as a "unit of appellation" (for example, ruka, "hand") cannot be broken into smaller pieces with independent meanings.

References

1. ALLAN Kathryn & ROBINSON Justinya (Eds.), *Current Methods in Historical Semantics*. 2012. 1(58).

2. BLANK Andreas & KOCH Peter (Eds.), *Historical semantics and cognition* 1999. 2(115).

3. CROFT William, *Explaining language change: an Evolutionary approach*, 2007. 3(75).

4. GEERAERTS Dirk, *Theories of Lexical Semantics* // Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2009. 4(103).

5. GEERAERTS Dirk, "Lexicography and Theories of lexical semantics", *in* DURKIN Philip // *The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2016. 5(438).

6. KAY Christian & ALLAN Kathryn, "Change in the English Lexicon", *in* MERJÖ Kyto (ed), *The Cambridge Handbook of English Historical Linguistics* // Cambridge: Cambridge University press. 2016. 6(224).

7. MATRAS Yaron, *Language Contact* // Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2016. 7(95).

8. TRAUGOTT Elisabeth & DASHER Richard, *Regularity in Semantic change* // Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2005. 8(119).

9. DE SMET Henrik, "How gradual change progresses: The interaction between convention and innovation". 2012. 9(135).

10. DURKIN Philip, Borrowed words: a History of Loanwords in English // Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2014. 10(321).

11. Djurabayevna, D. N. Comparative analysis of magical jewellery and ornaments in English and Uzbek fairy tales. JournalNX, 7(06), 138-142.

12. Rasulov Z. (2023). Lisoniy tejamkorlikning axborot ifodasidagi ortiqchalikka munosabati. https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/10944