

THE WORD AS A SMALL SYNTAX OBJECT

Abdurayim Turobov

Samarkand state institute of foreign languages Samarkand, Uzbekistan Email:
turobov1970@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: In the article, the word is studied as a basic unit of grammar, its transformation into different forms, categorization into morphemes, and the connection with one another, the syntax as active objects of study. While lexicology examines a word on the one hand, morphology examines it on the other, while syntax studies it on the other. But these checks are interrelated, all of which together require that language be a system. Ways of word formation show that it is related to both lexicon, phonetics, and syntax.

The introduction of the term word syntax into our linguistics requires the study of syntax into major and minor syntax, and it is scientifically based that word syntax remains one of the main objects of study of minor syntax.

KEYWORDS: denotation, signification, lexeme, phoneme, morpheme, word, word forms, semantema, idiomatic, expression structure, semantic structure, syntactic relation.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the main characteristic features of the word is that it is an object for the practical application of phonemes and morphemes. This integrative feature of the word forms a hierarchical relationship among the phoneme and the word and the morpheme. This is important because, at the word level, not only the syntagmatic relationship of small language units, but also the hierarchical relationship between them, occurs at the same time.

The difference of the word from other minimal linguistic units is again seen in the fact that in it we always see the expression of a meaning which is inextricably linked with the concepts of denotation, signification. In a phoneme, such a feature is not observed at all, and in a morpheme, for example, in a stem morpheme, although a closeness to the word is observed, there is no denotative-signifier relationship. Hence, the word has a special significance in that it directly names things in reality.

V.G.Gak interprets the word as a basic unit of language. His opinion about this is exemplary: «Рорытки замены понятия» слова »s drugimi ponyatiyami okazyvayutsya bezuspeshnymi, tak kak znachenie ponyatiya« slovo »imenno v tom, chto ono ob'edinyayet priznaki raznykh aspektov grammogo, zvymatic yazyka: zv. Slova-osnovnayaedinitsayazyka, kotorayadlya ego nositeleyvlyayaetsyapsycholingvisticheskoyrealnostyu »[1: 466].

It should also be noted that the issue of using other terms instead of words is still on the research agenda. Some linguists find it expedient to use the term lexeme instead. For example, in the textbook "Modern literary Uzbek language" by Sh.Rakhmatullaev we see that the concept of the word is completely denied. The scientist emphasizes the superiority of the term lexeme and comments on this: This means that a lexeme exists in language memory as a linguistic unit, participating in speech with a syntactic description"[2:22].

It is possible to fully agree with Sh. Rakhmatullaev's opinion that a lexeme is a linguistic unit and belongs to the richness of the dictionary. In our view, however, the scholar's claim that a lexeme takes on a syntactic description in speech is controversial. Because the transfer of a lexeme to speech is related to the concept of a word. In speech, words and phrases are used to get a syntactic description. Moreover, the use of the term lexeme does not negate the concept of the word. In fact, the concept of a lexeme arises according to the plan of expression of the word (plan vyrajeniya), and according to its semantic plan (plan soderjaniya), more precisely, the concept of semantema within the semantic plan.

The notion of a lexeme does not negate the notion of a word, but has a common meaning with it in the lexical pursuit of language. The concept of a lexeme is actually Greek (Greek) (lexis), meaning a word. The extent of application of this concept varies within the framework of general linguistics. However, it should be noted that the term is used more in Russian linguistics. We see that the English linguists J.Lyons and P.Matthews used it as Russian linguists understood it. In American linguistics, the concept of a lexeme was first introduced by B.Wharf (1938). However, we observe that American linguists defined the concept of lexeme differently from Russian linguists. According to him, idiomatic (single-syllable and multi-syllable) units in a dictionary are called lexemes [3: .257].

The study of the morpheme as a basic unit of language in the research of the American linguist G.Gleason was mentioned above. However, he does not use the term lexeme and does not use the term word either. According to him, there are three components that can be the linguistic object of language, and they are as follows. Expression structure, semantic structure and vocabulary. The next of these components covers all the specific connections that exist between the expression plan and the content plan. In other words, it covers the meaning of the word.

G.Gleason points out that words are not the same, some of them are very moving and some are passive in nature. According to him, passive words go out of consumption (mortality) by about 20% in about a thousand years [4:37].

It should also be noted that G.Gleason rarely uses the term lexeme, even though in some parts of his research he simply uses the term word. According to him, the morpheme is the basic unit of language [4:37].

Some linguists study the word as a unit of language and speech. In this case, the word as a unit of language is described differently from the word that is considered a unit of speech. We see the proof of opinion in P.S.Kuznetsov. The scholar argues that a word as a unit of language corresponds to a lexeme and can be called a lexeme. In his view, the definition of a lexeme should be derived from the definition of a word [5:10].

In our opinion, this opinion of P.S.Kuznetsov sounds scientifically. Because the basic unit of the lexical content of a language and the language system in general is the word. In it we can observe not only the object of activity of phonemes and morphemes, but also their syntactic relations.

In recent years, the concept of lexeme has become widely used by Uzbek linguists. We have already referred to the research work of Sh.Rakhmatullaev. Now we will focus on how the description of the issue was interpreted by H.Nematov and R.Rasulov. They describe the lexeme as follows; "A lexeme is a type of morpheme that is ready, general, obligatory for members of society, consisting of a stable combination of form and content, forming an object, sign, feature and relationship in reality, incorporating grammatical morphemes in speech and vocabulary" [6:37].

Apparently, this definition of a lexeme is similar to the definition of a morpheme in descriptive linguistics. However, it is not mentioned in this work that the term lexeme is actually a Greek word meaning "word". The given definition can be applied to the word as well.

H.Nematov and R.Rasulov note that the definition of a lexeme does not contradict the definition of a morpheme, but rather complements the definition of a morpheme, dividing morphemes into lexemes and suffixes. In our view, the definition given to a lexeme at the same time makes the lexeme look like a different name for a morpheme. It is also mentioned in the work given in the link that there is no big barrier between the lexeme and the grammatical morphemes, and here, too, there seems to be some explanatory case.

In this work, it is emphasized that the most important feature of a lexeme is its "readiness", i.e not artificial (6.38). If we agree with this opinion, then we have to renounce artificial words from the status of lexemes and deny that they are ready to be used for members of society. According to A.Khojiev, an artificial word is not a unit of speech, but a unit of language. In this regard, the scientist emphasizes the following: "... let us consider the feature of the lexeme being ready (not divided into parts) and an artificial word being divided into parts. There is no doubt that stone, sweet, bald, etc., which are not divided into parts, are lexemes. But the fact that an artificial word has components cannot deny that they are a lexeme. Because, first of all, artificial words are also ready, common for members of society. The same is included in dictionaries, given as a keyword. Launched in speech as a ready unit.

As we look deeply into each field, so does its object, and in recent times the field of study of syntax has expanded. Until now, mainly syntax has studied phrases and sentences, but now simple artificial words, compound words, complex syntax devices, and paragraphs are also becoming the object of syntax scrutiny. There are several argumentative factors for the study of construction and compound words as a syntactic phenomenon. Our opinion can be substantiated as follows:

1. If a phoneme basically expresses a meaning, a word can express an idea as well as a sentence along with the meaning. In other words, the word has a nominative and a significant function.
2. The word is the object of examination of all departments of linguistics. Compound and compound words are the product of a syntagmatic series and are studied in syntax. For this reason, primitive words are irrelevant to the syntactic branch of linguistics.
3. From the point of view of derivation, affix morphemes in the composition of artificial words perform the function of an operator [7: 9].
4. Lexical and syntactic derivation occurs within a word. This can be called a microsyntactic-relation.
5. Different semantic-syntactic relations can be expressed in compound words [8: 109].
6. Simple constructions and compound words become synonymous with speech. This can be called a lexical-syntactic synonymy:

A car driver is a person who pulls a car.

Fisherman - A fisherman - a person who sells fish - can be understood as a person who grows fish. Language always strives for conciseness, likes simplicity. For this reason, it is more convenient to say fisherman than to say someone who sells fish. J.Eltazarov created a monograph on this [9: 104].

While lexicology examines a word on the one hand, morphology examines it on the other, while syntax studies it on the other. But these checks are interrelated, all of which together require that language be a system. Ways of word formation show that it is related to both lexicon, phonetics, and syntax.

Considering word formation as a separate part of grammar, such as morphology and syntax, implies grammatical word formation [10: 8].

Three different suffixes are added to words, but not all suffixes add the same syntactic relation or connection. For example, modifier suffixes add a word to a word and perform a syntactic function. Form-forming suffixes do not

form syntactic relationships when added to the stem or base: yaxshi + roq, uka+ ginam, kelin+ chak, kitob + lar. Here the stem morpheme and the affix morpheme come into contact. But this relationship is happening within a word. In the example of word-forming suffixes we see a complete syntactic connection. For example, in the case of making the names of the executor, the executor and the object of execution can be clearly observed within a word: terim + chi, gul + chi, suv + chi. From the examples given, the relationship of possession + cut completeness is clear. The word gul + chi means a person who takes care of a flower. We observed the syntactic relationship that occurs in a sentence within a word. Both are equal, expressing the same meaning. It can also be called a lexical-syntactic synonym.

Any syntactic relations in a word medicine cannot be called syntactic relations. For example, the word paxta + kor, the word daraxt+ lar are examples. In Uzbek linguistics, the relationship of morphemes occurring at the word level was first described by prof. N.Turniyozov called it a microsyntagmatic relationship and introduced the term "word syntax" [11:22]. N.Turniyazov believes that word-changing affix morphemes show not only the context of one word, but also the syntactic connection with other words, the syntax of the word is fully reflected in the example of word-forming affixes [11:23]. We fully agree with these views.

It can also be a single word. Examples of this are vocative sentences, incomplete sentences, adjectives, and adverbs. More often this situation occurs in the verb phrase denoting action, in incomplete sentences. For example: o'qidim –Men o'qidim, keldi –u keldi, ko'rding –senko'rding. In other words, we see a sentence within a word. The ability of a word to express an independent thought in the process of speech, to perform a clear syntactic function, is studied in large syntax.

From a logical point of view, the expression of a sentence is directly related to the predicate. This, in turn, indicates that a factor in the status of the predicate is present in the latent state in the internal structure of the artificial word. It is this situation that makes it possible to prove that there is an expression of judgment in the artificial word. For example, consider the word interpreter. In this we see that there is a phrase and a hidden meaning of the sentence that can be formed in the form of a person who is engaged in the work of translation - He translates. In both places, the existence of an imaginary internal predicate in the case of translating, engaging in translation, requires no explanation. Even when we complicate the internal structure of this artificial word in the form of translation or interpretation, the predicate factor mentioned still works, and the given sentence fully expresses that each of the artificial words is connected with a specific sentence expression. When commenting on the artificial word, some linguists point out that its structural state is in the status of a syntagma. For example, the English linguist G.Marchand notes that the artificial word is formed within the framework of Saussure's syntagma theory. In this process, the scientist draws attention to the observation of the status of the determinant-determinant, which is characteristic of the syntagma [12: 147]. In our view, we can agree with Marchand's comment that we can interpret the operator as a broad determinant in relation to the operand of artificial word derivation. However, E.S.Kubryakova is critical of Marchand's view and points out that many secondary and single morpheme artificial words in syntagmatic language units are overlooked [13: 241].

In our opinion, E.S.Kubryakova's comment here seems to be controversial.

Because in the internal structures of artificial words of a secondary nature, all the above-mentioned cases (internal predication, sentence expression) are observed. Compound words with a single morpheme are not the same for all languages. In addition to the above, it should be noted that the syntactic relationship of the morphemes that make up the internal structure of the artificial word differs from the relationship of the object of examination of the larger syntax and the words involved in the sentence. Speaking about this, N.Turniyozov and H.Khairullaev note the following: "Obviously, the syntactic relations of the components of the word structure (morphemes) are not subject to completely analogous rules with the interaction of the components of speech. Because speech is the highest level of hierarchical relationship of language units. The relationship of words in a sentence is always dynamic. The syntactic relationship of word structure components has a static status. However, there is a commonality in the principles of their formation. [14: 38-39].

Based on the above, we can argue that the first syntactic relations of language units are born in morphology (the interrelation of phonemes is no exception) and it is expedient to call such a relationship a microsyntagmatic relationship. Evidence of our opinion can be seen in the comments of N.Turniyazov: "It is characteristic that we study the relationship of words as a syntactic phenomenon, and interpret the relationship of morphemes as a morphological phenomenon. However, in both cases a syntactic relationship (macro-micro- in the first case and microsyntagmatic in the second) is observed [15:26].

Clearly, the interrelationships of language units occur in a syntagmatic sequence. From the interconnection of phonemes to the interrelation of words is also subject to this rule. However, as mentioned above, language units differ from each other in form and function. Therefore, we think it is appropriate to use the concept of "microsyntagmatic relationship" when interpreting the interconnection of dynamic language units, and the concept of "syntagmatic relationship" when studying the interconnection of words. This can also be explained by the fact that in the syntagmatic order the interconnection of words is free, and the interconnection of phonemes and morphemes is not free because they are static in nature. For example: The night has already begun (Omon Mukhtar).

The order of the words in the quoted sentence can be changed as desired: The night has already begun – Already, the night has begun –Already, has the night begun. Of course, the internal weights of these statements

cannot be said to be the same. Because word change depends on which word order in the sentence is logically emphasized. But at the same time, the focus is on this, as the main goal is to show that the use of the word is dynamic. The word order of morphemes or phonemes cannot be changed in this way.

E.S.Kubryakova interprets the interconnection of language signs (units) in the word structure as a syntactic phenomenon and gives an example of artificial words. Of course, in every artificial word, we see a secondary characteristic sign of language. Therefore, E.S.Kubryakova interprets artificial words as a secondary nominative phenomenon and emphasizes that the occurrence of this phenomenon is subject to syntactic rules [16: 108].

It is possible to fully agree with the opinion of E.S.Kubryakova. This is because word formation directly requires the phenomenon of secondary nomination, in which a syntactic relationship is formed as a result of the interconnection of the morpheme. However, this syntactic relationship is formed not at the level of the syntactic unit, but at the level of the morphological unit. We therefore use the concept of a microsyntagmatic relationship here, and we think that this concept can be applied to the interpretation of the problem of horizontal row connection not only of morphemes but also of phonemes.

At the word level, the interrelationships of language units are divided into the following two distinct types: 1. The interrelationships of phonemes that form the primary nominative unit. 2. Interrelation of morphemes forming secondary nominative unit. In both cases there is a microsyntagmatic relationship. However, the emergence of a nominative unit does not always lead to the occurrence of a microsyntagmatic relationship of language units. Because units, which are larger than a word, word combinations and sentences, are also nominative units.

It should be noted that the affix morpheme, which forms its lexical derivation at the level of the artificial word, acquires a polyfunctional value. We see this in the fact that it gives a positive meaning to the internal structure of the artificial word, and at the same time transforms the sentence representing the execution of a sentence into a nominative unit that realizes the concept representing the meaning of the subject.

It is well known that all words are also considered nominative units according to the general rule. This shows that they are a non-predicative unit. However, when we think about artificial words, we have to deviate from this rule for a while. In other words, artificial words, if the interpretation is permissible, do not obey the traditional rule of this type. For example, consider the word teacher – o'qituvchi. At the same time, the artificial word acquires a predicative sign as well as a message expression in the style He teaches. However, this predicative sign is implicit, not explicit. Therefore, at the moment, there is no direct response to the situation. If we change the status of this artificial word and raise it to the level of speech, we will see an explicit attitude to reality. This also has a drastic effect on its expression of the propositive meaning, i.e., it translates the hidden propositional meaning into the explicit propositive meaning. In addition, in this process, even a small syntax check object becomes a large syntax check object.

Of course, at this point we don't want to think about large syntax check objects, because our main focus is on explaining small syntax problems. True, large and small syntax problems often intersect. But even so, their objects of inspection are drastically different from each other. For example, the concept of "word syntax" in itself indicates that the speech is focused on small syntax problems. Small on-syntax issues are also considered when approaching the problem description from an onomasiological point of view. Because, in this case, the study of problems related to lexical units is put on the research agenda. When we approach the issue in this way, we approach onomasiological morphology. After all, morphology also refers to the word.

However, it should be noted that today, in addition to the traditionally studied issues, new tasks are assigned to morphology. S.D.Kantselson states in this regard: "One of the serious shortcomings of traditional morphology is that it confused the inflected form with the grammatical form" [17: 120].

At this point, we should also note that the grammatical form of a word occurs not in word groups that require lexical units, but when they are actually used in speech and take on the function of parts of speech. Therefore, S.D.Kantselson emphasizes that word groups and their classification should be only one aspect of the problem to be dealt with by morphology, and the parts of speech related to the grammatical forms of words should be the second aspect of the problem. According to the scientist, the idea that traditional morphology is a science that studies words and word groups has lost its validity [17: 22-23].

In our opinion, it is possible to agree with these comments of S.D.Kantselson. From this, of course, it should not be inferred that morphology is confused with syntax.

II. CONCLUSION

In short, artificial words are also a morphological unit, despite the fact that there is a syntactic relationship at their level. We mentioned above that artificial words are the objects of a small syntax check. Similarly, in the case of grammatical forms of words, in our view, a more serious conclusion needs to be made. We can say that this is based on traditional morphology. For example, the fact that almost all textbooks and manuals provide information about the syntactic function of modifiers can be a proof of our opinion.

The introduction of the term word syntax into our linguistics requires the study of syntax into major and minor syntax, and word syntax remains one of the main objects of examination of minor syntax.

REFERENCES

1. Гак В.Г. Слово // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. -М:1990-с 466.
2. Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирғиўзбекадабий тили-Тошкент, 2006, 22-бет.

3. Булыгина Т.В., Крылов С.А. Лексема // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. М.; 1990, -С.257.
4. Глисон Г. Введение в дескриптивную лингвистику. –М., 1959.
5. Қўчқортөв У. Сўз маъноси ва унинг валентлиги (ўзбек тилидаги нутқ феъллари материали асосида). – Тошкент, 1977. 10-бет.
6. Неъматов Х., Расулов Р. Ўзбек тили систем лексикологияси асослари. – Тошкент, 1995. 37-бет.
7. Турниёзов Н. Назарий грамматикадан очерклар. – Самарқанд, 1998 йил. 9-бет.
8. Мирзаев М., Усмонов С., Расулов И. Ўзбек тили. – Т, 1966, 109 – бет.
9. Элгазаров Ж. Тилдаги тежамкорлик тамойили ва қисқарув. –Самарқанд, 2004.
10. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси – Тошкент 1 том, “Фан”, 1975. 8- бет.
11. Турниёзов Н. “Зиёкор” журнали 2003. 1-сон. 22-бет.
12. Marchand H The cfnctagories and types of Present-day English word-formation. 2 ed –Minchen. 1969
13. Кубрякова Е.С. Теория номинации и словообразование// Языковая номинация. –М., 1977.-С.241.
14. Турниёзов Н., Турниёзова К., Хайруллаев Х. Структур синтаксис асослари. –Тошкент. 2009, 38-39-бет.
15. Турниёзов Н. Тил унсурларининг микросинтагматик муносабатлари хусусида // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти., 1998, № 5, 26-бет.
16. Кубрякова Е.С. Номинативный аспект речевой деятельности. – С108.
17. Кацнельсон С.Д. Общие и типологическое языкознание. –Л., 1986. – С.120.