

About Speech Levels and Interaction between Their Units

H. HAYRULHEY

SamSIFL, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Article is devoted to an actual problem interaction – linguistics of the text and speech. In article one of pressing questions of modern linguistics – a problem of levels of speech and definition of units making it is analyzed. As levels of speech are investigated a phrase (offers), the complex syntactic whole and paragraph.

Keywords: Linguistics, progress, linguistic communication, speech acts.

Progress achieved in the sphere of world linguistics has been making a great and indisputable contribution to the development of our science. Only some of the books published during recent years can serve as an evident to this: V.G. Borobotka “Principle of forming discourse. From psycholinguistics to linguosinergetics”; Krasnikh V.V. “Ethnopsycholinguistics and linguoculturology”; “Language and knowledge. Parts of speech from cognitive point of view. The role of language in the world cognition” by Kubriyakova E.S; “The bases of discourse theory” by Makarov M.D; “Language philosophy. Culture studies and didactics” by Rojdestvenskiy Y.V; “Keys to communication. The bases of communication theory” by Yakovlev I; “Linguistic communication and speech acts” by Bach K., Harnish R.M; “Linguistic theory of America” by Newmeyer F.L. and others.

It should be stated that units of each level themselves imply a separate system. The fact that, they enter into hierarchic relations and join the units of other levels, extends the notion of a system and produces an idea about a whole -language system. This situation can be observed not only in the relation between the units of language levels, but also in the combinations of speech units.

When speaking about speech units we must mention that this problem has just been included into the list of problems discussed in linguistic literature. Scientists have not come to one conclusion concerning the units of speech and appropriate levels. And the main reason for this that till the present moment linguistics has not distinguished language and speech, and consequently, language problems has been studied thoroughly, while speech problems left behind. There are a lot of positive effects of admitting speech linguistics as a separate branch of linguistics.

Development of speech linguistics as a separate branch indissolubly connected with the demands of science development; as our traditional linguistics lacks its power and sources to give scientific grounds for text linguistics and interpret problems connected with it. Besides this, it has become clear that the idea of including sentence into language units is wrong. But it is also wrong to come to conclusion that speech linguistics is prior to language linguistics. Speech linguistics is closely related to language linguistics; it deals with interpreting problems of the units bigger than language units, and their levels.

Even we can say that speech linguistics continues language linguistics. Therefore, units of language and speech and the hierarchic relationship between them act depending on each other. We can observe this in the process of segmenting text or when synthesizing text formation by inductive method. So, studying language and speech separately does not and cannot imply denying relationship between them. We can quote the following statement of V.B. Kasevich on this point: “We must distinguish language levels (of language system) and levels of speech activity. If a language level is a separate subsystem of language, that has its rank of language hierarchy, level of speech – is a separate “tact” or stage of language mechanism’s work, when some concrete subsystem or concrete language level participates in the process of production or perception of discourse” [1.21].

But V.B.Kasevich emphasizes that sentence and level expressed by it is related to language: “A fragment of complete information can not be expressed by any other language units smaller than sentence” [1.21]. We think that the ability of sentence to express a complete idea does not require it’s belonging to language units, as expression of a message is formed in speech. He gives hints at this idea being not final and writes: “The problems of the number and quality of language and speech levels activity are far from their final conclusion” [1.24].

As a matter of fact, levels of speech is a sphere of our linguistics that still needs an explanation; on the contrary, levels of language are studied thoroughly. It’s known that the number of speech units should coincide with the number of language units. But there are still no sound ideas about levels of speech because this problem

is controversial. Thus, it is difficult to compare the problems of investigation of speech and language units with each other.

We have mentioned that the phonematic, the morphematic levels are formed on the basis of such language units as the phoneme, the morpheme; and, the word and the lexematic level are above all others. The sentence level which is realized by means of words belongs to speech not language. However, V.M.Solntsev excludes phraseological units and idioms from this list [2.18]. In our viewpoint the question of phrasemes and idioms is open. It's true that most of the phrasemes and idioms can be considered as speech units, as they exist in the system of our language as ready-made. But wouldn't it be a mistake if we don't include into the language units the phrasemes in the form of sentence like "Alining tarvuzi qo'ltig'idan tushdi" (Ali was disappointed)? Of course, the components of the phraseme are used in figurative meaning: Ali dropped his water-melon from his hands.

But still, it is connected with semantic side of the problem. As for the syntactic features, this phraseme meets all requirements of sentence level. M.Mirtojiev states: "Though phraseme has a form of a phrase or a sentence and makes a lexical unit, it still possesses its syntactic features. So it is equal to words inside the sentence and functions as one of them. This can be equally applied to phraseological units in the form of phrase and those of sentences. But at this point we shouldn't forget that phraseology is a semantic phenomenon. For this reason, it can cause only semantic deformation, but not syntactic" [3.187].

Indeed, one type of phraseological units considered as a set phrase is important only from semantic point of view. But syntactically it's of no importance. Syntactic relations between the components of phraseological units can serve as a proof of our words. Sh. Rahmatullaev states to this point: "Syntactic analysis of a phrase analyzes the structure of language unit, not speech. Generally speaking, syntactic relations between the words comprising a phrase are constant and always inner" [4.10].

We can agree with considerations of both scientists mentioned above. But still, in Uzbek linguistics we can not see any research work in the form of monography on syntactic nature of phraseological units.

It is true that we can observe ideas remarks of this kind in recent manuals, educational supplies and some scientific articles. For example, H.Jamolkhonov states: "Connection of words in phrasemes doesn't differ from the one of the words in the structure of free combinations or sentences: they all are connected hierarchically, but: a) words in free expressions or sentences are connected in the process of speech, while in phrasemes, long before; and they are set" [5.206].

One more that thing should be stated is: when speaking about phraseological units, we think that phrasemes in the form of sentences find their real form in speech, while in language they have only patterns (models).

So, it is appropriate to consider sentence as a speech unit, while word combination as a language one. First, it stipulates an invariable structure, second, components of word combination in sentence become sentence components. This includes word combination into the list of speech units, and shows impossibility of interpreting it as a separate level. The fact that word combination is formed in the process of speech can not serve as a reason for this point.

The second unit of speech is a complex syntactic construction including several sentences and form hierarchic relations. Thus complex syntactic construction (traditional complex sentence) needs thorough investigation. Our linguists give different interpretation not only to the term "complex syntactic structure" but also to the term "complex sentence". Some linguists state that it is necessary to stop using the term complex sentence (Ovsyanko-Kulikovskiy, Sakulina, Kartsevskiy, etc.). They accept only the concept of a (simple) sentence. However, I.F.Vardul considers that not all complex constructions can be interpreted as simple sentences. Besides this, according to I.F.Vardulin's point of view, sentences traditionally called as complex sentences can not have the status of sentence, compound sentences have this status. But if there are no complex sentences what is the need of the concept of compound sentences.

Besides all other above mentioned scientists, I.F.Vardul follows L.S.Barkhudarov and G.V.Kolshanskiy and calls complex sentences as parallel constructions; he states that it is more appropriate to call compound sentences as whole sentences [6.70].

The unit of speech, which is bigger than sentence, is a paragraph. This status is connected with its integrative character, as independent sentences, paracelative and attached constructions, complex syntactic constructions come in the paragraph. L.G.Fridman also mentions paragraph as a unit of speech and says: "According to communicative plan sentence is the main syntactic unit. Levels bigger than sentence is complex construction and paragraph. If sentence has been studied from all its aspects, complex syntactic construction and paragraph have not been studied at all" [7.155-156].

This statement of Fredman is not out of place, of course. But he includes only independent sentences into the list of paragraph components and ignores complex syntactic construction and other syntactic structures.

Thus, we see that in his above mentioned idea, he emphasizes that complex syntactic construction is a speech unit. If syntactic construction is a speech unit, it forms bigger unit of speech than sentence, and if it is used as a paragraph component, it establishes hierarchic relations with it.

We must empathize that paragraph presupposes the highest level of speech and includes independent sentences as well as complex syntactic constructions; therefore it has integrative character. This is very important, as hierarchic relations of speech units are connected with that character of paragraph. Besides, this integrative character measures the degree completeness of the information expressed in the paragraph.

As a conclusion, we include sentence, complex syntactic constructions and paragraph into the list of speech units and on this basis we state speech levels having the same termination.

References

Касевич В.Б. (1977) , *Элементы общей лингвистики*, Москва.

Солнцев В.М.(1972), *О понятии уровня языковой системы // Вопросы языкознания*, №3, s.18.

Миртожиев М.М. (2004), *Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили*, Тошкент,.

Раҳматуллаев Ш. (1978), *Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли фразеологик лугати*, Тошкент..

Ҷамолхонов Н. (2005), *Нозирги о'zbek adabiy tili*, Toshkent.

Вардудль И.Ф. (1977), *Основы описательной лингвистики (синтаксис и супрасинтаксис)*,. Москва.

Фридман Л.Г.(1967), *К исследованию абзаца как синтаксической единицы (на матер. немецкого языка) // Уровни языка и их взаимодействие*, Москва s. 155-156.