



DOI: [10.5958/2249-7137.2020.01843.1](https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2020.01843.1)

## THE PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTICS AND CLASSIFICATION

I. Madrakhimov\*

\*Docent,  
Kokand State Pedagogical Institute,  
UZBEKISTAN

Email id: Madraximovilxomjon 1958@Kspi.Uz

### ABSTRACT

*The article is devoted to the process of classification assigning the essence of any research and the analysis of basic concepts related to it. Different approaches to classification in linguistics and the steps of linguistic classification are explained.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Classification, Source Of Research, Methodology Of Classification, Philosophy Of Classification, Linguistic Classification, Dichotomy Of Language And Speech, Semema And Version Of Semema, Phonetic-Phonological Level*

### INTRODUCTION

In linguistics classification is one of the important processes, it is both the beginning and the end of any research and investigation. It is known, when the researcher starts investigation, he/she begins this action depending on the position of linguistic units in a certain system and places the research results into a certain system too. This process is essentially classification. Because, a scientific conclusion requires giving a certain evaluation about the research being conducted, that is, classifying it. Unfortunately, in Uzbek linguistics the problem of classification hasn't been a special research source up to the present. As a result of it, in the special researches devoted to the classification of different language phenomena in Uzbek linguistics the essence of the methodology of classification, the basis of classification and philosophy of classification have not been revealed deeply yet. Because Uzbek science, in the fundamentals of European sciences, stayed behind from the great East philosophy, which was its basis (also for the European philosophy and methodology), in its developing step in the 40-90s of the last century and in the East in the X century the beginning of classification, linguistic classification of the universe which was considered to be the beginning of scientific analysis, its attitude to the scientific classifications were not absolutely paid attention. As a result, the researchers of the Uzbek language completely forgot the guidance of our great ancestors about it. For instance, the great

“Muallim as-soniy” (Abu Nasr Farabiy) wrote about it: “I will go to prove how the knowledge came out of substance and accident... it is obvious where the knowledge came out. It is known that it occurs by the relation of the position of substance and accident that received by senses and perceived by the mind in detail” [1, 78]. The great scholar wrote suggesting the theory: “Linguistic research and classification is the initial step of studying, investigating the source”. “As for how to teach and learn, how to express the idea, how to ask and how to reply, I confirm that the first knowledge about them was the object, that is, the knowledge about the language giving the name to substance and accidents” [1, 17]. These words claim once more that it is necessary to connect any classification, no matter it is scientific or philosophical, with the linguistic classification of this phenomenon.

There are conscious and unconscious approaches to the classification in linguistics. The main point of the unconscious approach is that, any sentence, any definition, whether it is negative, affirmative, adding, separating, equalizing, distinguishing or contrasting, is connected with classification. But we do not often realize that it is a classification and usually we just use it. Simply, if we say “A is a vowel sound”, then we would do a particular classification. In the sentence “A is a vowel phenomenon” we classified “a” at first, as a phenomenon, in our mind we noted that it belonged to vowels. This classification is practical, an unconscious classification.

No sentence is apart from classification. Even, a simple affirmative one “It is a book” is not apart from classification, because we added the object which the indicative word “the pronoun It” indicates into the group of “book”; separating it from “other things that are not books”, and mentioned that it belonged to the group of “book”. Such practical, unconscious, unintentional classification is a necessary practice in order to nominate something or express any idea that the speaker does not consider such situation as classification. And this is not studied in linguistics as classification either.

Classification in linguistics is a type of scientific classification that it is a process of identifying different connections of language phenomena and units with the similar and dissimilar, equal (the same level), bigger (higher level or step), smaller (lower step or level) units, separating paradigms, identifying and distinguishing the relations between the units in the paradigm.

The types of linguistic analysis are various. By linguistic analysis we understand any kind of classification related to the language. If it is necessary to distinguish the two types of linguistic classification, it can be divided as: the first type is the classification of linguistic units – the classification of structural units of the language; and the second type is socio-historical classification of the language. While the division of the language into levels, the differences and similarities between the particular various groups and units of the language units in the levels are studied in the classification of structural units of language, in the socio-historical classification of the language the genealogical, typological and geographical spread of languages, influences of the languages, their separations and joining, the types of the relations of the language with the society are studied.

Before discussing the problems of pure linguistic analysis a very confusing problem – linguistic analysis and “language and speech” dichotomy should be mentioned. Because classification usually works with generality – categorical phenomena, signs and features. In language generality and privateness, GEOR (Generality, Essence, Opportunity, and Reason) and IPRR

(Individuality, Phenomenon, Realization, and Result) are usually compared in different levels as the units of different levels – language and speech levels.

Because the classification relies mainly on the categorical features – general features, it can be considered to be the practice appropriate only to the units of language levels. It is not true. For instance, the classification of phonemes and the classification of speech sound must not be confused. Or it is not possible to make semantic classification of sentences equal to structural classification of sentence patterns. There arisen a question whether in general, in classification speech results are involved in classification or not? The problem is that the nature of the units of language and speech levels and to make a list of the units of each level. The question that has to be discussed and decided is that what is speech or what is language phenomenon. For example, a derivative word. We remember that this problem was put under discussion again by the academician A.Khojiev after H.Ne'matov, O.Bozorov [2], R.Saloev [3]: which level does the derivative word belong to?

There can be only one base (ground): is there semantic or functional specializing in the derivative word or not? If there is specializing, the derivative word takes place in the dictionary and becomes a language in some degree. The following steps should be separated in being a language:

1. Being specialized.
2. Being consolidated.
3. Being simplified .
4. Stemming.

In being specialized the derivative speaker and the listener are consolidated in the mind of the members of the society and connected with a certain concept and this derivative is perceived by the speakers out of the text too as a symbol. From this point of view let's analyze the words tashkilotchi (organizer) and tafsilotchi (descriptor). Firstly, the word tafsilotchi (descriptor) is noted neither in explanatory dictionaries nor in the spelling dictionaries. The word tashkilotchi (organizer) is noted in both types of dictionary. Why? The answer is very simple: the word tashkilotchi (organizer) is specialized, consolidated, with one meaning for the Uzbek and connected with a certain meaning, information or concept in their minds and therefore takes place in the dictionary, can live in their minds without a text too, remains in the memory. The word tafsilotchi (descriptor) has no such characteristic of being consolidated and specialized. But, isn't the derivative of tafsilotchi (descriptor) particular to Uzbek speech? It is not correct to say that it is not particular or it is impossible. The derivative word tafsilotchi (descriptor) can be easily used in speech in the meaning of a person, a document or a means that gives the detail description of something or an event. It is not unfamiliar to Uzbek speech. But specialization and consolidation don't happen in it. Therefore it can be used only in a certain context or in a certain speech situation and can be clear to the Uzbek only in that speech situation. The word tashkilotchi (organizer) doesn't differ from the word tafsilotchi (descriptor) in structure, but completely differs from it in meaning. The phenomena of specialization and on this base consolidation of the meaning can be observed in it. This consolidation occurs firstly, in one meaning only among the several meanings of the word tashkilot (organization) which is in the function of the base of word formation in the Uzbek language. The Explanatory dictionary of the

Uzbek language gives only the meaning “muassasa” (organization, institution) of the word tashkilot (organization). Whereas, there is also another meaning of the word tashkilot (organization) in our language, such as “organizing, making, creating and establishing”. For example, Muhokamaning **tashkiloti** Salimga yuklatildi. (The **organization** of the discussion was on Salim’s responsibility) (here it is used in the meaning “organizing”). In the word tashkilotchi (organizer) the base of word formation is used in the same meaning as “organizing” and the lexeme tashkilotchi (organizer) shows the semantic change of the part in the function of the base of word formation as the cause of semantic consolidation which is specialization and its result. In such cases it can be said that the derivative words, which have taken place in the dictionary but the outward, formal structure is obvious, cannot link as a speech unit. Only the derivatives which are formally and semantically divided and haven’t taken a place in the mind of the Uzbek as certain wholeness can be evaluated as a speech unit. So, classifying the derivative words into language and speech levels is one of the complicated problems.

Another problem of pure linguistic classification connected with lexicography is to classify the versions of sememas and semas in the word and indicate them in the dictionaries. In Uzbek linguistics this problem was investigated specially in the works of B. mengliev and Sh. Bobojonov [5, 178] and in the works of A. Hojiev, [5], Sh. Rahmatullaev [6], M. Mirtojiev [7], G. Nematova [8] together with the semantic structure of the word and the problems of its description.

In distinguishing the independent versions of sememas and semas in the word the theory “dependent” and “free bound” connectingly “the same bound” should be the base. If one word can realize two or more sememas in the same bound, such sememas are independent sememas and they need to be given and classified separately in the dictionaries. For instance, “Ikkita olmani kesdik” (We cut two apples). In this context does the word apple realize two meanings or one meaning? Because, usually, in the words nominating plants the meanings plant, that’s an apple tree, fruit (apple) and harvest occur as different versions of one semema realizing in different contexts (bounds). But in the cases like “Olmani kesdik” (We cut the apple)”, “The apricot dried”, “The peach rotted” the words apple, apricot and peach are realizing two sememas in the same context and the meaning “harvest” and “plant” of these words should be described as an independent semema.

The problems that tightly connected with classification as in the above can be seen in the units of each level. In particular, in phonetic-phonological level identifying the components of phonemes, for example, is there long “i” or not in the Uzbek language, is the speech phonetic variant “iy” in the words such as sina – siyna, Samarkandi – Samarkandiy a diphthong or an independent phoneme? Or do the front rows and back rows of the phonemes, allophones belong to language level or speech level? The questions such as in grammatical layer the independence of linguistic-syntactic patterns, identifying if it is a separate LSP (linguistic-syntactic pattern) or a speech form of one pattern, if it is a version of one LSP or synonymy of LSPs are also connected with the problems of linguistic classification. Finding correct answers to them is the actual problem before our linguistics.

**REFERENCES**

1. Abu Nasr Forobiy. Fozil odamlar shahri. -T.: Abdullab Qodiriy nomidagi xalq merosi nashriyoti, 1993.
2. Nematov X., Bozorov O. Til va nutq. -T .: "Kituvchi", 1993. -30 b.
3. Saloev R. Ozbek tilida ismi-foillar: Filol.fanl.nomz. ... diss. - Samaraand, 1994.
4. Mengliev BR Lisoniy tizim yahlitligi wa satulararo munosabatlar: Filol.fanl.dokt. ... diss.-T., 2002.
5. Kozhiev A. Ozbek tili morphologasi, morphemikasi va soz yasalishining nazari masalalari. - T .: "Fan", 2010. - 253 p.
6. Ragmatullaev Sh. Semema - mustaqil til birligi. // Ÿzbek tili wa adabiyoti, 1984. № 5.
7. Mirtozhiev M. Ozbek tilida polysemy. -T .: "Fan"., 1975. -140 p.
8. Nematova G. X. Ÿzbek tilida Ÿsimlik nomlari lexemalari: tizimi va badiy qŸllanishi: Filol.fanl.nomz. ... diss. -T., 1998.