

RELOCATION OF LANGUAGE LABELS TO SPEECH

Suleymanova Nargiza Mardonovna

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign languages, PhD, Doctor of Philosophy on philological sciences, docent of the chair of English theoretical aspects.

Balyasnikova Marina Alexandrovna

Senior teacher, Chair of English Lexicology and Stylistics
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages.

Ravshanova Raykhona Farrukhovna

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages.

Abstract: This article deals with linguistics aspects of the speech units and its nominative features. The initial form of the evolution of thinking is in a nonverbal state, its formation is connected with language. In this process, it invariably correlates with the language system. Since, whatever the speaker thinks, it is realized only through language. In other words, it is difficult to imagine thinking without language. Language not only gives verbal expression to thinking – it involves a certain force necessary for its development. This device is not attracted from outside for the practical use of the language system. Having an immanent (out of external influence) character, it structures energy within the system. For this reason, as a theory of the meaning of a self-regulating system in modern linguistics, it is called synergetic.

Keywords: speech units, synergy, syntactic structure, language, speech, communicative function.

In the 20th century in linguistics, it is necessary to differentiate between language and speech as a great positive event. This is important, even nowadays, some linguists consider language and speech as a common phenomenon.

F.de Saussure was scientifically based on the "language and speech" dichotomy. However, the essence of this issue is justified. The proof of that is that today's speech linguistics has received a special scientific status. This, of course, is bound to the name of Saussure. When he read a lecture on general linguistics for students at the University of Geneva, he emphasized: "Yes, ladies and gentlemen, about the same linguistics, but I dare to say that the area of this linguistics is very extensive and it consists of two parts: one is closer to the language, a passive stock, the other is closer to the speech and is an active force ...".

As it is evident, F.de Saussure has foretold in his time that linguistics should be learned as part of language and speech linguistics. Of course, the problems of language have been thoroughly studied before the modern development of the linguistics science. However, the scientific validity of speech linguistics is just acknowledged and gives life guidance.

It's noteworthy that this is of great significance because, at the same time, the problems of foreign linguistics have been included in the agenda of our research, and the human factor is also studied as the strongest cognitive-pragmatic tool. Therefore, the 21st century linguistics has an anthropocentric status.

In fact, the anthropocentric course in linguistics has come to our forefront in the 70's of the last centuries was. The proof of that is that a large part of the French language linguist Emil Benvenist's "General Linguistics" is called "Man and the Language" ("Человек и язык").: "It is in language and through language that a

person is constituted as a subject, for only language lends reality, its reality, which is the property of being-the concept of Ego -" mine, I ".

As noted above, the human factor in the development of language and its practical application has not been adequately addressed so far. However, this does not mean that the issue of human factor is neglected in linguistics. It is noteworthy that the well-known linguist Vonn Humboldt did not comment on the issue of human factor in studying the philosophical issues of the language. The issue of language and thinking is always in the spotlight of our linguists. The current issues of cognitive linguistics are being studied in the name of philosophy of the theory of knowledge. It is only a novelty that a linguist acquired his linguistic status today.

It is also worth mentioning that all subjects studied by cognitive linguistics require the content of language elements. In addition, such issues include those that are subject to external linguistic research. In other words, the problems of cognitive linguistics do not include issues such as the system, its reality, the interconnection of system units, their language-to-speech, and so on. The object of the main cognitive linguistic survey, in our opinion, is closely linked to the communicative function of the language. That is why E.A. Popova's cognitive linguistics is not the only field studying human attitudes toward this language We fully agree with his opinion. The following are some examples of his remarks: "... Anthropology is the most accurate and accurate understanding of the epithet's present paradigm because it is also possible not only to explore the cognitive character of the language, but also to its functional-communicative aspects." The main unit of communication in today's linguistics, as all the units of the language are interconnected. But the text consists of sentences (phrases). Of course, in the broad sense, we use the language in the text. However, it should be noted that the individual application of the language is sophisticated in sentences. It is therefore desirable to interpret the phrase (s) as the basic and minimal unit of the communicative process [7, 71].

In the modern linguistics text is called a discourse. The word (высказывание) in most cases necessitates that.

In this case, though we have to retreat, we have to pause briefly about the phrase and phrase. Both sentences and phrases are actively used in our language. But with the sentence; not common concepts. The concept of cumulus often includes all the syntactic structures used in our speech. The concept of speech calls for a grammatical category.

However, it should be noted that, in many sources, sentence concept is interpreted as a common phenomenon. In some cases, emphasis is placed on sentence concept. The concept of speech remains secondary. In this regard V.Kasevich noted the following: "Sometimes we even come up with the notion that linguists have been thought of, and that there is no such unity in practice."

But even though this is the case in the linguistic term, it does not matter. That's why we use synonyms in our research as a synonym for phrases and phrases.

Emil Benvenist emphasizes that an individual act, which is an important tool in utilizing language, will first activate the speaker as a speech process. It emphasizes that the language will exist as a unique opportunity until the sentence is formulated

and that the speech process will become an active tool that will enable the human to operate through sounds.

In our opinion, the pragmatic activity of the speaker begins and the gradual transformation of the linguistic units into the speech from each sentence begins. In other words, the inductive method of speaking in linguistic units is activated, and the result is the text. From a pragmatic perspective, the speaker's illogical plan will be fulfilled.

Of course, all of these events are related to the communicative process, because the speaker (human factor) is important. U.L. Chafe emphasizes that the psychological state of the speaker and the listener is also important. He believes that the semantic structures associated with the thought are transformed into phonological structures in the human brain, thereby creating an inextricable relationship with the linguistic thought process. It is difficult for any language phenomenon to be examined without human thinking, in other words, what is happening in his mind.

As it is evident, LL Chafe's linguistic views focus on inductive learning, based on private knowledge. However, these views of the scientist constitute only one aspect of the general issue. Linguistic research is closely related to the collective language acquisition. Because the language, and in particular the majority of issues related to its practical application, are also interconnected with the ability of the public to speak the same language.

However, it is remarkable that U. L. Chafe's remarks on the part of the communicative process are always related to extraneous media and that it plays an important role in the use of speech. This is because the functional activation of language units occurs within pragmatic factors. Especially, the speech environment plays an important role. The use of a specific linguistic context can be found in a speech setting and can be traced back to the second circumstance. In this process, the context will have a great influence. According to E.Paducheva, many words cannot mean independent meaning. The word that comes out of context is, in most cases, very meaningful and, when used in the sentence, implies a meaningful unity (nomadic unity). In addition, the word used in the sentence is indefinable, but the general meaning of the sentence may not necessarily be the same as the meaning of these words. This type of description of the problem indicates that each word (or a nomadic unit of the language) can only perform certain functions in a context, a syntactical chain of chains, and have a certain meaning [5, 12].

It should also be noted that linguistic units have a functional value in the synthesis of the lingual ingredients analysis can be more accurate and more accurate when system-structured. In other words: "The systematic approach to the description of the problem in the study of speech activities and related problems is the most reliable tool". E.V. Ponomarenko, in contemplating this, reiterates: "The language is a functional system in which its units are interconnected."

The language system can be divided into two ways: 1. Methodology as a logical principle. 2. The language of the immanent (non-external influences) character. Of course, these concepts are interdependent and require the existence of the other one. However, while studying the functional value of language units, the latter is of the utmost importance. The main reason for this is that the language

system (in the case of an immanent characteristic system) has synergetic power. If you see that synergetic is self-governance, then the language system does not require explanation [4].

At the same time, we emphasize the notion of the language system. But we do not want to deny that speech is a complex system. Of course, the speech is also supported by this synergetic force. Human factor participation is inevitable. At the same time, however, the speech has only relevant aspects, and their functional activity relies on synergetic power.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Davis Steven. Speech acts, performance and competence. Journal of Pragmatics, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1979, №3, P. 491-505.
2. Чейф У.Л. Значение и структура языка. - М.: УРСС, 2009, 426 с.
3. Касевич В. Б. К 28. Семантика. Синтаксис. Морфология. — М.: Главная редакция восточной литературы издательства «Наука», 1988, 320 С.
4. Князева Е.Н., Курдюмов С.П. Основания синергетики. Режимы с обострением, самоорганизация, темпомеры. –СПб., 2001.
5. Падучева Е.В. О семантике синтаксиса – М., 2009.- С.12.
6. Пономаренко И.В. О развитии системного подхода в лингвистике/, Филологические науки, 2004, №5. -С.24.
7. Попова Е. А. Человек как основополагающая величина современного языкознания// Филологические науки, 2002, М.3.-С.71.