

PAPER

THE MANIFESTATION OF LOCAL EXPRESSIONS ACROSS LANGUAGE LEVELS

Ergashova Muhayyo Valijonovna ¹, *

¹Associate Professor of Kokand State University

* muhayyoergashova@gmail.com

Abstract

This article analyzes the manifestation of local expressions in the phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and semantic levels of the Uzbek language. It explores the linguistic means of expressing the concept of "space" through prepositions, adpositions, place names, and other elements. The study also examines the role of locally meaningful units within the language system, their formal-semantic features, and their interactions within the linguistic field. The paper highlights how local expressions are realized across different language levels, supported by theoretical and practical examples.

Key words: local expression, language levels, spatial concept, formal-semantic analysis, adpositional units, linguistic field, syntactic structure, semantic category.

Introduction

Every thing and event, action and state, sign and feature is reflected in the human mind and finds its expression through language. The concepts of space and time are no exception.

The expression of space through linguistic means constitutes the field of locality. In linguistics, locality combines various means related to space.

In recent years, it has been recognized that space and time have metric and typological properties according to the basis of expression. The metric properties of space and time are measurable, visible and relative properties reflecting the quantitative relations of being. These include properties such as scale, homogeneity, isotropicity [Nazarov, 2005: 138].

Linguistic concepts included in the field of locality have a heterogeneous nature, since locality is expressed at different levels of language.

The word heterogeneity is derived from the Greek word heteros - different, different [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1990: 103]. The term heterogeneity is explained in O.S. Akhmanova's "Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" as belonging to a different gender (genus). [Akhmanova, 1966: 97].

In recent years, the concept of heterogeneity has also begun to enter Uzbek linguistics. In the existing literature, it is

recognized that heterogeneity is a universal phenomenon, while the concept of homogeneity contradicts it, and that homogeneity is a phenomenon specific to a number of levels.

In particular, D. Nabieva, discussing invariant-variantity, illustrates the above concepts as follows: "... any real pronounced units that affect our sense organs are considered variants, and the generalization in the form of possibilities hidden under these units is considered invariant. From this it becomes clear that invariant and variant are not homogeneous phenomena in the same series, but heterogeneous phenomena in different series" [Набиева, 2005:5]

First of all, the speech process is considered a product of the activity of the organs of speech. Therefore, each sound that makes up the speech stream arises as a result of the movement of a specific organ of speech. The sign of the movement of these organs of speech creates a sign of locality in phonetic units. In particular, consonants are formed as a result of the air flow coming from the lungs meeting an obstacle in a certain place of the oral cavity. The place of this obstacle is considered a local sign of this sound.

So, the local sign for consonants, if we approach it from the point of view of the concept of primary and secondary signs of matter in philosophy, is considered a primary sign.

In addition, the elements of the world surrounding us,

reflected in the human mind, and their various signs, find their expression in his language using special linguistic means, in particular, lexemes. That is, there are certain lexemes from the lexical system of each language, in whose semantic structure the locality seme occupies a central place, in which case locality is considered a central seme. Such lexemes are lexemes that are adapted to express locality. Therefore, these lexemes form a local lexicon, just like the temporal lexicon, which is adapted to express the meaning of time and forms a separate lexical-semantic group (LSG) with this unifying seme.

In the current Uzbek language, there are a number of lexemes expressing local meaning, such as place, place, space, village, city, village, country, in which the locality seme is the central seme and this seme is considered the general seme that unites the locality field.

The characteristic feature is that such words, regardless of what conjunctive suffix they receive in the sentence and what part of speech they appear in, retain the locality seme and the question where? related to this seme. For example, in the sentence Our city is becoming more and more prosperous, the lexeme city, which falls into the locality field, is connected to the participle in the sentence by means of the main conjunctive form and appears as the possessive, but it retains the question where? aimed at determining the local seme.

Or in the sentence "The city's beauty is being added to the beauty of the city," the same lexeme, although it appears in the syntactic function of a determiner linked to the object with the help of the demonstrative conjunction, finds its expression in the question, because this fragment answers the question "Where?". Thus, each lexeme belonging to the local lexicon can appear in the sentence as different fragments of speech, but its local seme is preserved and the question is asked depending on this seme. It seems that not only cases of place, but all fragments of speech can be expressed by words with a local seme and have the meaning of place. The sign of locality is also related to the phonetic architecture of the lexical units of each language. In phonetics, the terms anlaut, inlaut and auslaut are used to express locality.

Each language differs from the language of another family in the phonetic structure of words. The phonetic structure of lexemes and the initial, middle and final parts of the word have their own characteristics. This is of great importance in distinguishing strong and weak positions of vowel and consonant phonemes, in determining the freedom and limitations of their places of use. For example, the final position of the lexeme, i.e. auslaut, is considered a weak position for expressing the sonority and unsonority signs of consonant phonemes. Therefore, in the same position, sonorous and unsonorous consonants lose their distinctive sign. Or in the inlaut, the open syllable position is considered a weak position for narrow vowels, therefore they are reduced in the same position, etc.

4. The position of the syllables of polysyllabic lexemes relative to the stressed syllable is also closely related to locality. The stressed syllable is a strong position for the pronunciation of vowels, and the unstressed syllable is a weak position.

5. Locality is also expressed in secondary names formed by derivation. Such local lexemes are formed on the basis of the word formation model of a particular language using special formation tools.

In the Uzbek language, such lexemes are formed using suffixes such as -zor, -iston, -goh, -lik.

6. A lexeme that has acquired certain relational forms enters into syntagmatic relations with other lexemes of the same form. Some of the relational morphemes that serve to ensure the syntagmatic relationship of word forms also have the grammatical semantics of locality.

In particular, the forms of the conjunction, along with

expressing the subordinate relation of the subordinate word to the dominant word, also express the place of emergence, direction, emergence or non-emergence of the action-state expressed by the lexical meaning of the dominant part. Such conjunctions contrast with the head and directional conjunctions on the basis of the sign of locality. The conjunctions of the exit, place, and destination are characterized by having a sign, while the other two do not. Therefore, the first group of conjunctions are also called local conjunctions. In this respect, the accusative conjunction occupies an intermediate position. Because this conjunctive form is connected to transitive verbs and expresses the place of occurrence, the point of occurrence of the action understood from the dominant part. The only difference between accusative conjunctions and local conjunctions in expressing the meaning of place is that while the place seme of local conjunctions is considered a stable, permanent, central seme, the place seme of the accusative conjunction is considered a boundary seme.

7. The syntactic functions of local lexemes are specific for the cases of place. Therefore, syntactic structural units also have specific means for expressing locality. Such syntactic units are considered the central means for expressing syntactic locality. In addition, at the syntactic level, there is also the concept of the position of the parts of speech relative to the clause, which is also inextricably linked with the meaning of locality. The syntactic position sign is of great importance in determining the thematic-rhematic function of the formal structural units of a sentence in the communicative structure of a sentence, that is, whether they are functional or non-functional parts for the sentence structure. However, the next case is considered a boundary sign in expressing the local meaning of the parts of speech and the sentence.

Thus, locality is a semantic category inherent from the phonetic level to the highest level of the language structure.

At each level, there are central units that represent this semantic category, specific to this semantic, as well as boundary units that serve as auxiliary means in expressing this semantic.

All linguistic units involved in expressing the semantic of locality can be combined into one semantic field - the locality field.

All linguistic units that are combined into the locality field differ from linguistic units that are combined into the locality paradigm by the sign of heterogeneity. Depending on this sign of heterogeneity, linguistic units that are included in the locality field can be classified into the following meaning groups:

1. Generative locality. Such locality arises in connection with the place of appearance (birth) of sounds.

2. Positional locality. Such locality occurs as a result of the syntagmatic relationship of linguistic units with other similar linguistic units within a larger linguistic unit. The positional locality can be defined as the sign of the location of parts of a word relative to each other in different places of the whole, the location of a linguistic unit relative to the stress, which is the phonetic peak of the word, and the segment, which is the semantic and grammatical peak of the sentence. Therefore, positional locality is inextricably linked to syntagmatics, and therefore it is realized only through syntagmatics.

It should be noted that both of the above localities are outside the internal structure of the linguistic unit and have a relativity sign.

1. Nominative locality. Such a locality is considered the center (core) of the locality field and includes nominative units that are designed to express local signs in objective existence. Locality is the denotative meaning of such units, and local units are the nominal of such meanings.

2. Derivative locality. Such a locality is inextricably linked with nominative locality, is its constituent part. The difference

between nominative locality and derivational locality is at the level of naming. If root lexemes have a place semantics, the locality expressed by them is considered nominative locality. Derivative lexemes formed by adding place-forming suffixes to the base part denoting things and phenomena are considered secondary names, and the locality expressed by them is derivational locality.

3. Relational locality. Locality expressed through forms expressing syntactic relations is considered to be relational locality.

Thus, each lexeme belonging to the local lexicon can appear in the structure of a sentence as different parts of speech, but its local sema remains intact and the question is asked depending on this sema. It seems that not only cases of place within the parts of speech, but all parts of speech can be expressed from words with a local sema and have a place meaning.

Thus, locality is a semantic category inherent in the structure of the language from the phonetic level to the highest level. At each level, there are central units expressing this semantic category, characteristic of this sema, as well as boundary units that act as auxiliary means in expressing this sema. All linguistic units involved in expressing the local sema can be combined into one semantic field – the locality field.

References

1. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. М.: СЭ, 1966..
2. Философский словарь М., 1986, с.75.
3. Фалсафа асослари. (тузувчи ва муҳаррир Қ.Назаров) Тошкент: “Ўзбекистон” нашриёт матбаа ижодий уйи, 2005.
4. Фалсафа асослари. (тузувчи ва муҳаррир Қ.Назаров) Тошкент: “Ўзбекистон” нашриёт матбаа ижодий уйи, 2005.
5. Фалсафа асослари. (тузувчи ва муҳаррир Қ.Назаров) Тошкент: “Ўзбекистон” нашриёт матбаа ижодий уйи, 2005.
6. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. М.: СЭ, 1990.
7. Набиева Д. Ўзбек тилининг турли сатҳларида умумийлик-хусусийлик диалектиказининг намоён бўлиши. Тошкент: Шарқ, 2005.