METHODOLOGY OF STUDYING UNITS OF THE LEXICAL LEVEL

Makhsudova Holiskhon Ummatovna
PhD in philological sciences, associate professor,
Department of Uzbek Language and Literature
Andijan Machine-building Institute, Andijan, Uzbekistan

Abstract

Background. In certain socio-historical and evolutionary conditions, one or another group of lexical units in the language has relative independence, and it is important to define the onomastic vocabulary layer existing in the language, the principles of secondary naming of existing objects. In the process of historical formation, onomastic units form a linguistic layer of secondary names on the basis of individual interpretation of the nominations of the linguistic image of the world. Describing the specific characteristics of onyms also includes linguistic and cultural concepts based on certain values.

Methods. Methods such as system-structure, description, comparison, classification, contextual, linguacultural analysis in linguistics are used to clarify the problem posed in the article.

Results. The units of the lexical level of a particular language enter into mutual paradigmatic relations, form a whole system and are in constant motion based on the principles of complexity, order, generality-specificity.

Conclusion. Since the second half of the 20th century, the science studying the lexical level of the language has moved from descriptive lexicology to the stage of systematic (theoretical) lexicology, and its theoretical foundations as a whole system have been generalized.

Key words

lexicology, onomasiology, linguoculturology, linguistics, lexical level, system-structural linguistics, semantics

Introduction

Among the layers of language, the most variable, constantly moving part is the lexical layer. Processes in social society are first of all reflected in the lexical structure of the language. Scientific and technical progress, the creation of new technical and household production tools, the emergence of countless concepts in social relations appear in our linguistic consciousness through words. Such news, especially in today's information age, is increasing day by day and hour by hour.

This shows that the lexical layer is a unique complex system in constant motion in a specific language structure.

The study of structural relations and functional properties of language units is one of the leading principles in the development of modern linguistic theory. In traditional linguistics, research was mainly focused on morphological and syntactic phenomena, and the issue of studying lexical units had a special descriptive character. At the current stage of the development of linguistics, when the anthropocentric approach became the fundamental basis in the scientific field, the sociolinguistic and linguacultural features of lexicology began to be studied in all aspects.

One of the central problems of linguistics is the question of the systematic nature of language. Systematicity in language manifests itself in a set of elements connected with internal relations.

Methods.

From the beginning of the 20th century, a new approach to studying phenomena as elements of a complex structure was formed in a number of disciplines (psychology, philosophy, literary studies, natural science, etc.) based on the understanding of phenomena. At the same time, the term "structure", in contrast to a simple combination of elements, denotes a whole of interrelated phenomena, each of which depends on the others and can only be related to it. Thus, the concept of structure began to be applied to language [6, c.37]. The term "system" in linguistics defines the construction of language, the structure and order of its components, a set of units of the same type connected by regular relations.

Since the terms structure and system represent close concepts that require each other, there are no controversial descriptions of their relationship. The following definition of M. Abuzalova and S. Nazarova revealed the essence of the matter: "Since the system is a structure, it will definitely have a structure. The internal connection of the elements that make up the system constitutes the structure. Therefore, the concepts of system and structure are interrelated concepts. The structure is the internal structure and construction of the system, the form that unites the elements of the system [1, c.55].

According to A.Nurmonov, F. de Saussure's approach to language as a whole consisting of the relationship of elements, recognizing speech activity as a whole consisting of the interaction between language and speech, defining the synchronic and diachronic state of language and his elucidation of the nature of signs laid the groundwork for the birth of structural linguistics [9,c.54].

Also, the scientist emphasizes that the emergence of structural linguistics was also caused by the achievements of natural sciences in the 20th century. Thus, the term "structure" began to be understood as the method, nature, and law of relations between the elements involved in the structure of a certain whole. In this period, the concept of structure became a popular concept for all disciplines. Linguistics is no exception. Under the influence of such a general trend, systemic-structural linguistics came to the field [9, c.54].

According to E. Benveniste, Saussure never used the word structure, the most important thing for him was the concept of system. The novelty of his teaching is the idea that language consists of a system, gradually recognized and developed by linguists over time [3, c.61]. It should also be mentioned here that the terms systematic linguistics, structural linguistics, and system-structural linguistics are used in parallel to express the same methodology.

There are three classic schools of structural linguistics that have adopted the teachings of F. de Saussure to one degree or another: Prague (functional linguistics) led by N.S. and America led by Z. Harris (descriptive or distributive linguistics).

Yu.D. Apresyan, if all the linguistic schools that violated the tradition to one degree or another are considered to be types of structuralism, then Geneva (Sh.Bally, A.Seshe, A.Frey), Moscow (R.I.Avanesov, P.S.Kuznetsov, A.A.Reformatsky, V.N. Sidorov , A.M.Sukhotin) and London (J.Fers, W.Haas, M.Holliday) schools should also be included among them, but despite the fact that each of them made a great and unique contribution to the development of linguistics, they were classified as F .de believes that one cannot agree on Saussure's theory of language [17,c.36].

The strength of F. de Saussure's ideas lies in emphasizing the role of structure, functions and relationships. And the weakness of the theory was that the absolutization of the role of these factors led to a further departure from the linguistic substance. It found a complete expression in the field of general principles in the concept of L. Elmslev.

In particular, we believe that it is permissible to comment on the founding of the school of glossematics of structural linguistics by L. Elmslev and others at the University of Copenhagen in the 30s of the 20th century. Glossematics (Greek: glossematos-language) is a general linguistic theory, which is essentially related to F. de Saussure's teaching and is very close to it. The methodology of linguistic analysis in glossematics is characterized as deduction. It should lead to the definition of the system based on the text being analyzed. For this, the initial data - the whole text is divided into small parts (steps, sentences, words, syllables and

phonemes) with consistency. At each stage, the main method of determining the unit is analysis. The second important stage of the analysis in glossematics is to consider the functions between language units. Glossematics provides effective results in the formal analysis and description of language phenomena arising from interdependence [19]. It is important for our work that glossematic methods are also used in onomastic analysis.

Results.

L. Elmslev strives to build a theory of universal language, and this universality is achieved by fully materializing language and depriving it of any elements of development. Glossematics represents the language only as a phenomenon with a synchronic plane, an abstract system of pure relations, ignoring the uniqueness of the specific features of the structure of each language and the uniqueness of the forms of their existence.

According to the theory of L. Elmslev, the researcher should study only the structure of relations existing in the language, not the relations of real linguistic elements. Thus, individual elements of a language are nothing but a set of functions, and the whole language is a network of functions. L. Elmslev introduces many new concepts and terms in his works, and the method itself forms an extremely complex form of logical construction. L. Elmslev defines language as follows: "Language is a hierarchy, relationships allow each part to be divided into subsequent classes. Thus, each of these classes can be divided into derivatives determined by mutual mutation. Any structure that satisfies this definition is a language. In language practice, as we understand it, there are special cases of such a structure" [5, c.38].

L. Elmslev firmly grasped F. de Saussure's idea that "Language is a form." Therefore, in his linguistic concept, form is understood as a kind of stability as an abstract essence. He stated that any form is manifested in various material forms in direct observation. These various material manifestations of the known essence are considered substance. For example, the meaning of going home has various external expressions. Using a sequence of sounds (phonetic tool), using a sequence of letters (graphic tool), by telegraph using Morse code, using gestures (paralinguistic), by engraving on a notebook (tool for the blind) and others. These various embodiments of one common essence are substances [10, c.74].

Valuing the scientific-theoretical importance of structural linguistics, V.A. Vinogradov emphasizes that it influenced the development of structural research methods in other humanities - literary studies, art studies, ethnology, history, sociology, and psychology. It is known that, on the basis of these sciences,

structuralism was formed as a philosophical and methodological basis of concrete scientific humanitarian research (it is also called "French structuralism"). V.A. Vinogradov points out that structuralism should be distinguished from structural linguistics in this sense. The structural description of the language includes the analysis of the real text in such a way as to distinguish generalized invariant units (sentence patterns, morphemes, phonemes) and associate them with specific speech segments based on strict implementation rules. These rules define the limits of variability of language units in speech. Structural linguistics is considered as a separate stage in the development of linguistic thought associated with the transition from the empirical "atomistic" description of linguistic facts to their systematic understanding. The basis of this transition was the use of structural analysis, modeling, formalization of linguistic processes [4].

V.A. Zvegintsev, in the article "Structural Linguistics" published by Vige Brøndal in the first issue of Acta Linguistica (Copenhagen) in 1939, states that the general theoretical basis of the need for a systematic approach to language learning is very clearly expressed.

The most successful aspect of the system-structural direction was that its methodological foundations and general work principles allow to harmonize and generalize the language material of a certain level based on its specific aspects. Based on the principles of interpreting language as a system, Ferdinand de Saussure, V. Humboldt, A. Mays, V. Matezius, N. S. Trubetskoy, L. Elmslev, E. Sepir, B. Whorf, I. A. Beaudoin de Courtenay, L. V. Sherba, V. V. Vinogradov, M. M. Pokrovsky and other advanced scientists developed the theoretical issues of lexical systematics.

"System - a set of interconnected elements (of any nature) according to certain characteristics and having internal integrity, expressed in the relative autonomy of aspects (or) existence." [15, c.48-49]. Therefore, stability, interdependence and internal integrity are important principles in the internal mechanism of the system.

N.A. Kuzmina's "Sovremennyy russky yazyk. Lexicology: theory, training, control" (Modern Russian language. Lexicology: theory, training, control") study guide describes the features of the lexical system of the language. The scientist, in general, marks the main aspects of systematicity in the language, "does the lexical level system meet these requirements?" asks the question.

1) Integrity. A high level of coordination of the processes taking place in them, as well as representation of individual parts of the whole system;

2) Complexity (discretion). Any system consists of separate parts (subsystems), which in turn have a more complex internal structure;

3) Order. Constant communication is mandatory in the connections and relationships of subsystems that affect each other [8, c.5].

Within the lexical system, the polysemantic word, semantic fields, lexical-semantic groups (LSG), synonymous lines, antonymic pairs, arranged in contrasts such as "original - portable", "old - new", "active - inactive" there are subsystems. All of these are groups of words connected by systematic relationships of paradigmatics, syntagmatics and variants. However, the consistency of the lexical layer is manifested not only in the existence of certain groups or areas of words, but also in the specific nature of the use of words and their activity [8, c.5].

In this manual by N.A. Kuzmina, while thinking about the mutual semantic relations of the words in the vocabulary of a particular language, it is emphasized that the elements of the system are strongly interconnected: "there is no separate word in the lexicon outside of associative and cannot be, because each word is connected with others by dozens and hundreds of threads. The process of semantic transfer from one word to another is infinite, it covers the entire vocabulary [18].

E.V. Kuznetsova distinguishes two main types of system relations within the lexical system: paradigmatic and syntagmatic, and in addition to these, she also recognizes epidigmatic (D.N. Shmelev) or derivational (P.N. Denisov) types. And N.A. Kuzmina lexical system defines 4 types of relations: paradigmatic, syntagmatic, variant and manifestation relations (only for bilateral language units).

Paradigmatic relationships include synonyms, antonyms, homonyms, hypo-hyperonyms, and thematic paradigms.

Syntagmatic relations refer to the regularities in the composition of words and sentences in a linear sequence.

Epidigmatics (D.N. Shmelev's term) (Greek epidosis - "increase, increase") is a historically formed semantic derivative of the word. It establishes derivational intra-word relationships of meanings in polysemantic word structure, and also distinguishes one meaning from another [10, c.74].

Discussions.

A. Nurmonov emphasizes that the methodology of systematic linguistics and the method of verification have become popular in Uzbek linguistics since the 70s of the last century. In this field, prof. who divided the lexical units of the Uzbek language into macro and microsystems and recommended a number of their microsystems to his students as monographic research objects. Sh.Rakhmatullaev's services should be highlighted [11, c.186].

"Organic analysis methods have also been used in Uzbek linguistics. This was first of all manifested in lexicology. As a result, the lexicology of the Uzbek

language moved from the descriptive stage to a new - theoretical stage, to the stage of studying the lexicon as a whole consisting of certain lexical-semantic groups (LSG), a system consisting of the relationship of specific meaning elements of lexical units. With this, the transition from Uzbek descriptive lexicology to systematic (theoretical) lexicology began [16].

A number of scientific and theoretical works dedicated to the study of the lexicon of the Uzbek language as a system have been published. In particular, I. Kochkortoev's "Word meaning and its valence" (1977) [2], E. Begmatov's "Lexical layers of the modern Uzbek literary language" (1985) [13], H. Ne'matov and R. Rasulov's "О "Basics of systematic lexicology of the Uzbek language" (1995) [7], "Study of the lexicon of the Uzbek language based on the content field" by Sh. Iskandarova (1999) [14], "Research of the lexical level of the Uzbek language based on the principle of the system of systems" (2004) [12]) have been carried out.

Conclusions

Modern lexical systems are historically developed and have been formed for many years on the basis of the lifestyle, living conditions, cultural values, customs, mutual relations, linguistic thinking of a particular people, reflecting the world view, and the social- includes chronological features. The main feature of the lexicon of the language is that it is an open system, that is, the lexical content is dynamic and constantly changing. Certain changes occur in the lexical structure of the language, but there is no strict boundary between the diachronic and synchronic layers.

So, on the one hand, language is relatively stable as a system, and on the other hand, as a historical and social phenomenon, it is in constant movement and change. In the current scientific methodology of linguistics, the direction of linguosynergetics was formed in the study of such an internal organization process and the clarification of internal changes in the language system. Some principles of linguosynergetics methodology can be applied in the study of the lexical system, in particular, onomastics.

LIST OF LITERATURE

1.   Абузалова М., Назарова С. Систем тилшунослик асослари. Бухоро, 2008.

2.   Бегматов Э. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тилининг лексик қатламлари. – Т.: 1985.

3.   Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. Москва: Прогресс, 1974. – С.61

4. Виноградов В.А. Структурная лингвистика // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. // http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/496a.html

5. Ельмслев Л. Язык и речь // Звегинцев В.А. «История языкознания» Москва: 1960. - Б. 38

6. Звегинцев В.А. Истории языкознания XIX и XX вв. в очерках и извлечениях. Часть II. Москва, 1960. - С.37

7. Искандарова Ш. Ўзбек тили лексикасини мазмуний майдон асосида ўрганиш. Филол. фанлари докт…автореф. –Т., 1999.

8. Кузьмина Н.А. Современный русский язык. Лексикология: теория, тренинг, контроль. Учебное пособие. Омск, 2010. – С. 5

9. Нурмонов А. Танланган асарлар, 1-жилд, Андижон: 2012. - Б. 54

10. Нурмонов А. Структур тилшунослик: илдизлари ва йўналишлари. Ўкув қўлланма. –Т.: 2008. –Б.74

11. Нурмонов А. Ўзбек тилшунослиги тарихи. –Т.: Ўзбекистон, 2002. – Б. 186

12. Нурмонов А., Раҳимов А. Лингвосинергетикага кириш. Т.: Akademnashr,2013

13. Неъматов Ҳ., Расулов Р. Ўзбек тили систем лексикологияси асослари. –Тошкент, 1995

14. Собиров А. Ўзбек тилининг лексик сатҳини системалар системаси тамойили асосида тадқиқ этиш. –Т., Маънавият, 2004.

15. Тюхтин В. С. Системно-структурный подход и специфика философского знания//Вопросы философии. 1968. № 11. С. 48-49.

16. Қўчқортоев И. Сўз маъноси ва унинг валентлиги. –Тошкент, 1977

17. Ю.Д. Апресян Идеи и методы современной структурной лингвистики. М.: Просвещение, 1966. – С. 36

18. https://studopedia.ru/sistemnie-otnosheniya-v-leksike

19. https://qomus.info/encyclopedia/cat-g/glossematika-uz/