

**ON THE LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION OF THE WORD AND THE LEVEL
OF THE WORD***Xayrullayev Xurshidjon Zayniyevich**Professor, Doctor of Philological sciences**Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

Abstract: The basic unit of language is the word. Because the functioning of any language as a means of communication in society is primarily related to the word. Therefore, F. de Saussure said: "The word, regardless of all the difficulties associated with its description, occupies a central place in the mechanism of language." The article discusses how to characterize a word in a language system, what are the specific features of a word and a lexeme, the description of a word in paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, the role of words and lexemes in studying the internal structure of the language and related laws, the definition of a word and the level based on it within language units, the description of a word as a unit and a sign, how to understand the properties of a phoneme, morpheme and a word as a language unit.

Keywords: Paradigmatic relationship, syntagmatic relationship, language structure, language sign, language unit, morph, morpheme, concept of level, justification of levels, word, word form, types of morpheme, root, suffix, lexeme.

When F. de Saussure, discussing the word, singles out the difficulties associated with its description and reminds us that they create various obstacles to understanding the word as a concrete unit of language. For example, some words are extremely complex in nature, and they cause various confusions and difficulties by combining elements of a lower level than the word, while some words come from a higher level (compound words) and deviate from their own pattern, while others require the form of a morpheme. Based on this, F. de Saussure also noted that it is difficult to characterize a concrete unit of language through a word. Perhaps, this is why Saussure's student Sh. Balli emphasized the need to use the term semantics instead of the term word and said that it is necessary to abandon the concept of a word. I.F. Vardul also emphasizes that the concept of a word is ultimately vague, abstract, and that explanatory issues related to it are often observed, especially in the framework of lexicological and morphological studies. E.M. Lazutkina emphasizes the opinion of the famous linguist A.V. Dobiash that "Words are fragments of the whole (осколки целого)".

Of course, such ideas are scientific hypotheses, which are necessary for the development of our science. In the history of linguistics, more than three hundred definitions of a word have been given, and in them the word as a linguistic unit has been assessed both positively and negatively. However, it is difficult to get rid of the concept of a word. However, it is true that the concept of a word is an extremely problematic phenomenon for our linguists. In the words of A.M. Peshkovsky, a word is an unsolved riddle for our linguists. This can be observed in all issues related to the sound composition of a word, its morpheme shell, grammatical form, lexical meaning, etc. Because the fact that a single phoneme can also be used as a word, the fact that a root morpheme can express a lexical meaning and function as a word, the fact that several words can express a single lexical meaning, the fact that phraseological units can be equated with the

meaning of a word, the fact that vocatives can be used as sentences, the fact that a single word can express the meaning of the text, etc., show that this language unit is extremely complex. The famous French linguist (comparative scientist) A. Mayet, taking into account such “puzzles”, said: “The word, its linguistic nature, cannot be determined.”

Representatives of American descriptivism (in particular, L. Bloomfield, G. Gleason) almost do not use the concept of a word in the process of studying linguistic material. For example, we see that G. Gleason did not devote even a small section of his 24-chapter and 485-page work “Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics” to the issue of word description. The author mainly used the concept of a morpheme. However, no matter how difficult and complex its description is, it is undeniable that the word occupies a central place in the language system. Because we perceive language primarily not through forms or sounds, but through words. Words also form the vocabulary of a language.

It should also be noted that in some studies, it is emphasized that using the concept of lexeme instead of the concept of word is appropriate. This can be observed in the textbook “Modern Literary Uzbek Language” by Sh. Rahmatullayev.

Indeed, a lexeme is considered a lexical unit, and from this point of view, words in the dictionary of the language can be called by this name. However, the concept of a word seems to be of great importance in describing the grammatical form of a word.

In our opinion, firstly, the term lexeme can only replace a word as a structural element of the language. Secondly, in the function of a sentence component, not a lexeme, but a word concept is of paramount importance. Thirdly, a word can be called a lexeme only as a two-dimensional (expressive and expressive) unit of the dictionary. For example, the elements o'qiyman, o'qiymiz, o'qimoq require three words, but only one lexeme. Fourthly, a lexeme is a lexical unit, and a word is a lexical-grammatical unit.

A. Hojiyev, explaining a word as a lexical-grammatical unit, emphasizes the following: “It is incorrect to use the word “form” in relation to a word that is considered a lexical-grammatical unit, that is, to call it a “word form” or “form of word”.

Y. Tajiyev shows the difference between a lexeme and a word more clearly: “It (lexeme - X.X.) can be distinguished (if necessary) only by the fact that it can be used in relation to words that have a lexical meaning. ... A lexeme can never participate in speech in its entirety. It appears in speech only in the form of a morpheme, a word form.”

Of course, with the above considerations, we are not saying that the term lexeme cannot be an absolute equivalent of the term word. Because these terms can be used interchangeably. In general, the term lexeme is not interpreted in the same sense in linguistics. For evidence of this idea, we turn to the following opinion of I.F. Vardul: “Smirnitsky also uses the term “lexeme”. He calls a certain word and various word forms that occur with its participation by this name. Smirnitsky’s lexeme differs from ours in its lexically polysemous meaning. Our lexeme always has one meaning.”

I.F. Vardul also does not positively assess A.A. Zaliznyak's interpretation of the word pioneer as a single lexeme, despite the fact that it means "The first discoverer" and "A member of the Pioneer organization". In his opinion, there are two lexemes with a homonymous meaning in this place.

In American linguistics (B. Whorf, U. Weinreich), a lexeme is understood not only as a

unit equal to a word, but also as idiomatic expressions of various forms. Russian linguist V.G. Gak understands a lexeme as a unit that differs in the expressive aspect of the language. V.G. Gak first of all refers to the term *semantheme* and describes it as a semantic core that forms the expressive aspect of a word. Then, he says that a lexeme corresponds to a *semantheme* according to the expression plan. For example, each of the elements *veter* and *duet* requires separate lexemes and can be a counterpart to a common *semantheme* that gives the expressive meaning of “air movement”. It seems that in this case, two independent lexemes are equated in meaning with one *semantheme*.

In French linguistics, some studies describe the lexeme as a two-dimensional, but abstract unit, and in this respect it is shown that it is different from the relatively concrete unit - a word. In Uzbek linguistics, there is also no consensus on the definition of the term lexeme. Above, we familiarized ourselves with A. Hojiyev's definition of the lexeme. Below, we will dwell on the comments of H. Ne'matov and R. Rasulov on this issue. H. Ne'matov and R. Rasulov explain the lexeme as follows: "Lexeme is a linguistic unit. Each lexeme appears in speech as a specific word." Here we see that the lexeme is interpreted as a linguistic unit, and the word as a speech unit. In addition, H. Nematov and R. Rasulov also express the following considerations that distinguish between lexemes and words: “All words are formed in speech on the basis of lexemes or special word-forming patterns.”

In our opinion, this idea that a word is a speech unit and that any word is formed only in speech seems somewhat controversial. Because it is quite difficult to deny that not only root words, but also artificial words are already present in our language. The grammatical forms of words formed in speech are an exception to this.

In his commentary on the word, A. Nurmanov emphasizes the following: “The concept of a word occupies a central place in the history of linguistics. Despite this, there is still no consensus on the status of a word.” Therefore, the scientist says that it is appropriate to use the terms *lexeme* and *lexical morpheme* for the lexical meaning of a word, and the term *word form* for its grammatical meaning. In our opinion, this is similar to the discussion of the expression of thought. Because when we got acquainted with A. Hojiyev's opinion on this matter above, the concept of word form was denied.

It should also be noted that in linguistics, the opinions expressed on the concepts of *lexeme* and *word* are diverse and sometimes contradictory. Speaking about this, B. Mengliyev rightly emphasizes the following: “Although the *lexeme* is one of the most important and central concepts of linguistics, its content and boundaries cannot be said to have been clearly defined so far. ... It should be noted that in Uzbek linguistics the terms *lexeme* and *word* are still used side by side, and there are conflicting points of view, such as the desire to consider the *lexeme* as a linguistic level unit and the *word* as a speech level unit” [B.R. Mengliyev 2002: 13].

In our opinion, both the concept of *lexeme* and the concept of *word* have their own linguistic nature, and each of them has its own place of application. However, the central concept of linguistics, in our opinion, requires a *word*. Y. Tajiyev, in this regard, mentions the following: “The term *word* is used in relation to all units recognized as ready-made words in the language, it covers all of them. In fact, it is sufficient to use this term in relation to all words that have a lexical meaning and do not have a lexical meaning, and it is really acceptable to use them in units that are separated as independent words and auxiliary words, as well as in separate word groups. However, it is also possible to single out those words that have a special, lexical meaning and use

the term lexeme for them. However, it is not mandatory” (Y. Tojiyev).

Here, one can fully agree with Y. Tojiyev’s comments about words, especially independent words. However, it would be appropriate to mention the fact that auxiliary words also have the status of morphemes.

It is known that a sound cannot express any meaning by itself, and even if a morpheme does (except for morphemes that occur in the form of words), it is not independent in terms of syntactic use, while a word always means something, names things and phenomena in reality. Therefore, human thinking is always connected with words. In this respect, words constitute a priority level of language.

When a word is used in reality, in most cases it acts as an object for the activation of two or more morphemes. This indicates that the word is, from the point of view of principle, discrete (divisible). The morpheme is, of course, non-discrete. This characteristic is fully preserved not only at its own level, but also when used at the level of a larger word. However, it is difficult to make such a judgment about a word. Its decomposition, division into parts (morphemes) is studied only within the framework of the level to which it belongs. When a word is used in reality at a level larger than itself, its discrete nature is often not put on the agenda. For example, the study of a word used in a phrase or sentence into morphemes. Because the content of speech is perceived not through phonemes or morphemes, but through words. Therefore, the word is actively used in speech as an important unit of language. However, in the process of segmenting the text, the word can be studied by dividing it into morphemes, and morphemes into phonemes.

The speech functional value of a word occurs only in the structure of a sentence or text. Just as a word is a morpheme, so a sentence (word combination) is a word. However, in descriptive teaching, it is emphasized that the analysis of a sentence is carried out not with the help of words, but through morphemes (L. Bloomfield, G. Gleason). In our opinion, it is difficult to agree with this. Because this teaching also negatively affects the concept of pedantry. In the words of V.M. Solntsev, such an idea can be equated with the concept that a city is made of bricks, panels and blocks. However, when we think of a city, we first of all think of its buildings [V.M. Solntsev 1971: 252].

Of course, from the point of view of principle, a sentence can also be analyzed using the concept of a morpheme. However, in such a situation, the goal of the study should not be to break the text into the smallest units (segments). Only in this respect can the idea of descriptive linguistics be justified.

It should also be said that in linguistics there is also the idea that morphemes originate from independent words. This can be evidenced by the following words of F.F. Fortunatov: “Observations show that the origin of suffixes and prefixes, which make it possible to express new forms of words, is associated with the formal meanings of individual words (and the formal meaning of the word itself is based on the informal meaning). However, the formation of the roots of words of this type also occurs in the roots of individual words.

“...Of course, when we talk about the origin of affixes, I mean suffixes and prefixes. The history of infixes has not yet been well studied” [F.F. Fortunatov 1956:148-151].

This idea of F.F. Fortunatov, in our opinion, is fundamental. Because the transformation of independent words into auxiliary words, affixes is associated with the historical development of each language, and this phenomenon can be observed in almost all languages. For example, the fact that the words khona and noma, which were adopted into the Uzbek language from the Persian-Tajik language, also perform the function of affixes, and that many independent words

undergo grammaticalization and become auxiliary, can serve as an example of this. We can also see the theoretical evidence of our idea in the following remark of G. Paul: "Prepositions and conjunctions probably originated from independent words" [G. Paul 1960: 436].

Based on these, we emphasize the close relationship between morpheme and word. If the historical formation of morphemes in relation to independent words implies one side of the issue, then the inconceivable nature of word form, especially the form of coined words without morphemes constitutes the other side. This is very important. Because, when we say word, we understand not only root words, but also coined words. A coined word is considered a linguistic unit - a lexeme [A. Hojiyev 2004: 54]. A lexeme can be equal to a root or coined word [A. Hojiyev 2007: 21].

Constructed words differ from root words not only in the interconnection of morphemes, but also in the formation of microsyntagmatic relations in this connection. According to G.A. Smirnova, between morphemes at the word level there may be types of syntactic relations such as predicate, attribute, determiner, determined, which are observed within the framework of parts of speech [G.A. Smirnova 1972: 235-236]. Commenting on this, N. Turniyozov says that there is a great need in linguistics for grammatical objects that can be called "small syntax and large syntax" and emphasizes the following: "It is known that the word is the main object of study of all branches of linguistics. Therefore, the main object of study of small syntax should be the word. However, in small syntax, not root words, but artificial words are studied" [N. Turniyozov 1998: 7].

It should also be noted that both root words and coined words do not always coincide with each other as a unit in the vocabulary of the language and as a morphological unit. Speaking about this, V.B. Kasevich gives the following examples: domik, koshechka. These elements are words from a morphological point of view. However, they cannot be found in these analytical dictionaries [V.B. Kasevich 1988: 161-162]. This situation is also observed in the example of coined words: choyxonacha, oshpazgina, etc.

Usually, the opinion is expressed about the performance of a nominative or definitive function of words. However, depending on the requirements of use, an independent word may not be able to perform a nominative function. S.D. Katsnelson gives the word "дождь" as an example. If it is raining and people are upset about it and say "Дождь!", then there is no doubt that this word performs a nominative function. However, when we say "Дождь!" because of the gathering of dark clouds in the sky, this word does not serve to name the subject, but to characterize it [S.D. Katsnelson 1986: 26]. However, regardless of what functional value it acquires, a word requires a unity formed by the combination of a specific sign and its inherent meaning [T.A. Bushuy 2008: 25.].

In addition to the above, there are also independent types of words that cannot perform a nominal function. V.V. Vinogradov includes auxiliary words, exclamations, and introductory words and combinations among such words, and he calls pronouns the equivalents of nouns [V.V. Vinogradov 1972:17]. In our opinion, it is more appropriate to include auxiliary independent words in the morpheme sentence, taking into account the grammatical meaning of the word. Introductory words and combinations are an explanation in this regard. Some scientific sources explain that they can perform syntactic functions as tertiary parts of speech [A.R. Sayfullaev 2001], while others explain that they are the smallest unit of speech (autonomous) in the form of a monomial [K.A. Turniyazova 1989].

It is known that syntactic independence is not observed in independent words. Independent words are distinguished in this respect. However, some linguists argue that independent words also have syntactic independence. V.A. Kochergin tries to prove this as follows: "Independent words are also considered the minimum unit of the language and can achieve the status of syntactic independence. However, we will follow V.M. Solntsev and call this independence "negative" independence. "Independent words are always used with syntactically independent words" [V.A. Kochergina 1979: 86].

In our opinion, two different attitudes can be expressed towards these remarks of V.A. Kochergina. First, since independent words are deprived of the expression of lexical meaning, we cannot say that they can have a syntactically independent status. Second, if we take into account that independent words occupy a higher place in speech in terms of their functional position compared to syntactically independent words, V.A. Kochergina's remarks come close to a positive assessment. The fact is that independent words play a very important role in the transfer of independent words from language to speech. In this respect, independent words become dependent on independent words. For example, let's pay attention to independent words used with an auxiliary in Uzbek. If the auxiliary is omitted, the independent word used with it cannot fulfill its function in speech. Compare: Men akam bilan keldim - Men akam keldim.

In this respect, dependent words perform a more significant function in terms of their speech activity than independent words. However, we include dependent words in the list of morpheme level elements, since they do not have lexical meaning. Regardless of whether they are called words or morphemes, there is no change in their functional activity.

In short, all the above ideas and considerations show that the concept of a word is of a very complex nature. However, despite this, in order for a word to be a word, it must comply with the following principles: 1) phonetic integrity (a word must always consist of a set of phonemes, at least one phoneme); 2) semantic valence (each word must have a specific meaning that ensures its meaningful connection with other words); 3) not having two (double) accents (the word must be unstressed or single-stressed); 4) entering into a lexical-grammatical relationship (use in speech); 5) integrity (the impossibility of inserting another word in the middle of a word. In compound words) [V.A. Kochergina 1979: 83].

It seems that by the time of the current development of linguistics, each of the language levels was perfectly studied, and fundamental research work in world linguistics has emerged in this area. Each of the language levels is relatively independent (autonomous). The paradigmatic relationship between the individual level units can be studied only on the basis of the laws and rules of this level. It is difficult and impossible to study their syntagmatic and hierarchical relationships without referring to other level units. Therefore, the interpretation of phenomena related to the phonetic level of the language cannot be carried out without the participation of morphematic level units, and vice versa, the study of morphematic level units cannot be carried out without the participation of phonemic units. The interaction of language units is inextricably linked with their distributive properties. The relationship between elements a and b, which is possible in a given context, may not occur in another context, in which elements b and c may be connected. Therefore, the combinatorial relationship of language units is of great importance. This relationship has a constant value both in the paradigmatic and syntagmatic series. This, in turn, leads to the formation of a hierarchical relationship between language levels. However, the issue of language levels, in particular, their designation, has not been the only issue of linguists' opinions even to the present stage of the development of our science. In some studies, the

phonetic, word and sentence levels are included in the list of language levels, while in some works they are explained through phonetic, morphematic, word, word formation, morphological and syntactic levels. In addition, information is also provided about the existence of phonetic-phonological, morpheme-morphological, syntactic and lexical-semantic levels. However, the designation of language levels must be consistent with its units. Thus, the main levels of the language include phonetic, morphematic and word levels. The word formation level cannot have a separate status. Because, even a made-up word does not require a unit other than a word. Also, the concept of the lexical-semantic level seems very confusing. First, the term lexicon is inextricably linked with the concept of a word. Second, although the concept of semantics is related to all meaningful units of the language, it is not a unit of language.

In most existing research, language units are confused with speech units, and as a result, language levels are determined on the basis of speech-related units such as phrases and sentences. However, today, since speech linguistics has been scientifically established as an independent and influential branch (field) of linguistics, it is no longer a matter of time to study language phenomena separately from speech phenomena. However, this does not mean that language and speech are completely autonomous phenomena; they are both opposite and interconnected phenomena. One of the main principles for determining language levels is that their units should be considered linguistic features. However, they must have the status of language units. Therefore, although the phonemic level unit - phoneme - does not have the status of a linguistic sign, it creates a full opportunity for this level to be called by this name. However, the internal differential signs of phonemes do not have significance between levels; they constitute a merismatic level within the phonemic level. In other words, each macroparadigm of the language can only unite certain level units. Therefore, the macroparadigm that unites phonemic level units can only be a place for the union of phonemes, and their merismatic signs are also significant only within this level.

The linguistic nature of phonemic units is more clearly manifested at the level of a larger unit - a morpheme (or word), since in this case the phonemes form a syntagmatic relationship with each other and, at the same time, serve to form a morpheme. In this process, two units of language, non-meaningful and meaningful, intersect. When we consider a morpheme, we must also take into account that it can also be of zero expression. Such morphemes also have a grammatical meaning. When we say that the building material of a morpheme is a phoneme, we must understand this in a broad sense. Because a morpheme is formed not from phonemes, but from their sound shell. After all, the differentiation of both the morpheme and the word in meaning occurs through the sound shell of phonemes. The morpheme, as a small unit of language, also requires an independent level. However, it is difficult to agree with the opinion of some linguists (V. Skalichka) that the smallest unit of grammar is the sema. Because the concept of sema cannot be a grammatical unit. If this is the case, then it would be necessary to combine all the peculiar principles of lexicology and grammar. When a morpheme is used in real speech, its morph and allomorph forms arise. This, in turn, proves the invariant nature of the morpheme and, at the same time, indicates its integrative nature. A morpheme does not only have a grammatical meaning. The morphemes that make up the core of a word also have a lexical meaning. Therefore, the claim by some researchers that a morpheme must have only a grammatical meaning is controversial.

The basic unit of language is the word, which occupies a central place in the language mechanism (F. de Saussure). However, despite this, many issues related to the concept of a word,

its linguistic nature, are still unclear. Terms such as lexeme, semantic, lexical morpheme, which are used by linguists instead of the concept of a word, complicate the essence of the issue. The building material of a word is a morpheme. However, independent words can be interpreted as morphemes. For example: conjunctions, auxiliary (in Western languages, articles, prepositions, etc.), many exclamations and prepositions require not words, but morphemes according to their linguistic nature. In addition, in artificial and compound words, we also see that morphemes perform a microsyntactic function. In other words, we witness the performance of syntactic tasks at the word level. In general, the word remains the same as it was for our linguists. However, when viewed from the perspective of the hierarchical relationship of language units, at the word level it is the intersection of two meaningful units of language (morpheme and word). The word is considered the main means of transferring language units to the level of speech - the level of the sentence, both phonemes and morphemes are activated at the word level and are transferred through it to speech.

References:

1. Abduazizov A. Tilshunoslik nazariyasiga kirish. –Toshkent, 2010.
2. Khayrullaev K. Z. The relation of word, word composition and sentence to the predicativeness //Abstract of candidate dissertation.–Tashkent. – 2001
3. Rahmatullayev Sh. Hozirgi adabiy o‘zbek tili. –Toshkent, 2006.
4. Rasulov R. Umumiy tilshunoslik. –Toshkent, 2013.
5. Turniyozov N. Tilshunoslikka kirish. – Samarqand, 2006.
6. Балли Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. – М., 1955.
7. Бушуй Т.А. Краткая история развития лингвофилософии. – Самарканд, 2008.
8. Вардуль И.Ф. Основы описательной лингвистики (синтаксис и супрасинтаксис). – М., 1977.
9. Виноградов В.В. Русский язык (грамматическое учение о слове). – М., 1972.
10. Ирискулов И. Тилшуносликка кириш. –Тошкент, 2009.
11. Каримова Г. Ўзбек тилида грамматикализация –ходисаси. – Тошкент, 2010.
12. Касевич В.Б. Семантика. Синтаксис. Морфология. – М., 1988.
13. Менглиев Б.Р. Лисоний тизим яхлитлиги ва унда сатҳлараро муносабатлар// Докт. дис. автореф. –Т., 2002.
14. Мирзаев И. Термин/ <https://qomus.info/encyclopedia/cat-t/termin-uz>
15. Нетьматов Х., Расулов Р. Ўзбек тили систем лексикологияси асослари. –Тошкент, 1995.
16. Нурмонов А. ва бошқ., Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси. Морфология. – Тошкент, 2001.
17. Паул Г. Принципы истории языка. – М., 1960.
18. Солнцев В.М. Язык как системно-структурное образование. – М., 1971.
19. Соссюр Ф. де. Избранные труды по языкознанию. – М., 1977.
20. Турниёзов Н. Назарий грамматикадан очерклар. – Самарканд, 1998.
21. Xolmanova Z. Tilshunoslikka kirish. –Toshkent, 2007.
22. Хайруллаев Х. О лингвистической природе уровней языка и речи //Вопросы филологических наук. – 2009. – №. 2. – С. 78-79.
23. Ҳожиёв А. Ўзбек тили сўз ясаши тизими. –Тошкент, 2007.