

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

## International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2023 Issue: 04 Volume: 120

Published: 04.04.2023 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



**Nargiza Mardanovna Suleymanova**

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages  
PhD in Philological Sciences, Associate Professor  
Uzbekistan

**Sarvinoz Solekhonovna Alavkhonova**

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages  
teacher of English  
Uzbekistan

## TRANSFERING OF LANGUAGE SIGNS INTO SPEECH

**Abstract:** This article deals with the problem of the transition of linguistic units into speech. As we know, in the twentieth century a significant event took place in linguistic science – the need for separate study of language and speech was realized. More F.de Saussure talked about the need to divide linguistic science into two areas – language and speech.

**Key words:** speech, syntactic structure, nominatives, synergetic, language units.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Suleymanova, N. M., & Alavkhonova, S. S. (2023). Transferring of language signs into speech. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (120), 14-16.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-120-3> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.04.120.3>

**Scopus ASCC:** 1203.

### Introduction

The requirements to distinguish between language and speech were a great positive event in 20th century linguistics. The "language and speech" dichotomy was scientifically substantiated by F. de Saussure. Despite this, it is the real essence of the matter is only now being expressed. The proof of this is that speech linguistics has received a special scientific status today we will see. This, of course, is inextricably linked with the name of Saussure. The scientist gave a lecture on general linguistics to the students of the University of Geneva emphasized the following: "Yes, gentlemen, I ask you to notice the same linguistics, but the field of it is very wide. Linguistics consists of two parts: one is passive close to the language, the other active in speech".

It seems that F. de Saussure predicted in his time that linguistics should be divided into two parts: language and speech linguistics. Obviously, languages until the present period of the development of the science of linguistics problems were thoroughly studied. However, the scientific basis of speech linguistics has just been recognized and it is being given a chance to live.

In our opinion, this is of great importance, since at the same time the problems of external linguistics have also taken place on the agenda of our research, through which the human factor is also the most powerful cognitive-pragmatic tool is being studied. Therefore, he emphasizes that 21st century linguistics has an anthropocentric status.

It should also be said that all issues studied by cognitive linguistics require the substantive aspects of language elements. In addition, such issues are investigated in foreign linguistics includes objects. In other words, the problems of cognitive linguistics are the system, its realization, internal system unit's deals with issues such as their connection, their transfer from language to speech, etc. The main research objects of cognitive linguistics, in our opinion, is integral with the communicative function of language will be connected. Therefore, E.A. According to Popova, cognitive linguistics is not the only field that studies the relationship between language and the human factor we completely agree with his opinion. The following comments he made in this regard are instructive: "... anthropological epithet is the most convenient and correct concept in the study of the

## Impact Factor:

**ISRA (India) = 6.317**  
**ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582**  
**GIF (Australia) = 0.564**  
**JIF = 1.500**

**SIS (USA) = 0.912**  
**ПИИЦ (Russia) = 3.939**  
**ESJI (KZ) = 8.771**  
**SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184**

**ICV (Poland) = 6.630**  
**PIF (India) = 1.940**  
**IBI (India) = 4.260**  
**OAJI (USA) = 0.350**

current paradigm of the language. After all, it is possible to study not only the cognitive nature of the language, but also its functional and communicative aspects" [4, 71].

In today's linguistics, the text is shown as the main unit of the communicative process, in which all the units of the language intersect. However, the text consists of sentences. Of course, we note in the text that the language is used in speech in a broad sense. But it should also be said that the individual use of language occurs through sentences. Therefore, it is appropriate to interpret the sentence as the basic and minimal unit of the communicative process.

In modern linguistics, a unit of communication is called a discourse. And the sentence (высказывание) in most cases requires this very thing.

At this point, although there is a digression, we found it necessary to briefly dwell on the concepts of phrase and sentence. Both concepts of sentence and phrase are actively used in our language. However, phrases and sentences are not mutually exclusive concepts. The concept of a phrase includes all the syntactic structures used in our speech in most cases. In it neither predicative devices nor non-predicative devices are distinguished. The concept of a sentence includes a grammatical event, and therefore it is special requires a category.

However, it should also be said that in many sources, the concept of a phrase is interpreted as a common phenomenon with a sentence. And in some cases the main attention is paid to the concept of a sentence. The concept of speech remains secondary. In this regard, V.B. Kasevich notes the following: "Sometimes we even come across comments that the concept of a sentence was invented by linguists, but in practice there is no such unity" [2, 95].

Emil Benvenist emphasizes that the individual act, which is an important tool when we use language, first of all activates the speaker as a parameter of the speech process. Until a sentence is formed that the language exists in the form of a unique opportunity, and that after the speech process begins, it acts on a person through sounds specifically mentions that it becomes an active tool that creates conditions [1, 313].

In our opinion, it is in this process that the speaker's pragmatist activity begins, and the linguistic units necessary for each sentence are gradually transferred from language to speech. Otherwise in other words, at the same time, the inductive method of using language units in speech is active, and as a result, the text is formed. From a pragmatic point of view, this is the illocutionary plan of the speaker will be done.

Of course, all these events are connected with the communicative process, because in this place the speaker (human factor) plays an important role. W.L. Chafe emphasizes that the psychological state of the

speaker and the listener is also important. In his opinion, thinking the semantic structures associated with the language become phonological structures in the human brain, and thus linguistics has an integral connection with the thinking process (cognitive). It is difficult to study any language phenomenon without taking into account human thinking, in other words, what is happening in his mind [7, 47].

It seems that U.L. in Chafe's linguistic views, the main focus is on learning the language based on inductive that is, private knowledge. However, these views of the scientist, in our opinion, constitute only one side of the general issue. In fact, linguistic research is inextricably linked with the issue of language knowledge. As most of the problems are related to the language, in particular, to the issue of its practical application in this speech, it forms a unity with the cognitive potential of the masses [3, 199].

However, U.L. Chafe's comments that the participants of the communicative process are always related to the non-linguistic environment and that this is important in the use of language in speech is instructive [7, 47]. As a result of the functional activation of language units takes place in the environment of pragmatist factors. The speech environment plays an important role in this. Proof of opinion is the use of a specific language unit it is possible in the speech environment and it can be observed that it is negated in the second environment. In this process, of course, the context has a lot of influence. According to E.V. Paducheva, many words cannot mean an independent meaning by themselves. In most cases, words that come out of context are plural, and when they are used in a sentence, they require a single meaning unit (nominative unit). In addition, despite the fact that word used in the sentence is singular, the sentence is general the content may not come from the meaning of these words [5, 12]. Such a description of the problem means that every word (or to the nominative unit of the language) indicates a specific meaning only in the context, in the chain of syntagmatic lines.

It should also be said that the acquisition of functional value of language units in the process of their use in the syntagmatic line can be more perfectly and clearly observed when the analysis of language material is approached from the system-structural point of view. In other words: "In the study of speech activity and problems related to it, the approach to the description of the problem from the system point of view is considered the most effective tool" [6, 24]. E.V.Panomorenko rightly emphasizes the following: "Language is a system where each of the units functionally related to each other [6, 12].

Language system can be understood in two ways: 1. As a methodological principle. 2. In the form of an immanent (free from external influences) feature of the language. Of course, these concepts are interconnected, and one requires the other to exist.

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIHII (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

However, the second of them is of great importance in studying the functional value of language units is enough. The main reason for this is that the language system (meaning the internal immanent characteristic system) has synergistic power. If synergy itself if we understand it as management, then the fact that the language system has such a quality does not require an explanation.

At the moment, we are emphasizing the concept of the language system. But with this he wants to deny that speech is also a complex system we are not Undoubtedly, speech also operates within this synergetic force. It is inevitable that the human factor will be involved in this process. But at the same time,

the aspects of the speech are only relevant to him there is that their acquisition of functional activity relies on synergetic power.

In fact, during the transfer of language signs into speech, phonological units intersect with morphemes, and morphematic units intersect with words, thereby determining their functional value. Undoubtedly, the position of the speaker (human factor) is also important in this process. Because in his discursive activity, he is constantly engaged in choosing language symbols. In other words, as communication is formed through the human factor, not only the use of language units in speech, but also their acquisition of a certain functional weight is directly related to it.

## References:

1. Benvenist, Je. (1974). *Obshhaja lingvistika*. (p.447). Moscow: Progress.
2. Kasevich, V.B. (1988). *Semantika. Sintaksis. Morfologija*. (p.311). Moscow: Nauka.
3. Labov, U. (1975). O mehanizme jazykovykh izmenenij. *Novoe v lingvistike*. Vyp. 7, Moscow: Progress, pp. 199-229.
4. Popova, E.A. (2002). Chelovek kak osnovopolagaushhaja velichina sovremennogo jazykoznanija. *Filologicheskie nauki*, № 3, pp.69-75.
5. Paducheva, E.V. (1974). *O semantike sintaksisa*. (p.291). Moscow:Nauka.
6. Ponomarenko, E.V. (2004). O razvitii sistemnogo podhoda v lingvistike. *Filologicheskie nauki*, № 5, pp. 24-33.
7. Chejf, U.L. (1975). *Znachenie i struktura jazyka*. (p.431). Moscow: Progress.
8. Sossur, F.de. (1990). *Zametki po obshhej lingvistike*. (p.275). Moscow: Progress.
9. Nasrullaev, J. (2019). *Global English. In science and practice: a new level of integration in the modern world*. (pp. 176-178).
10. Yusupov, O. Y., & Nasrullaev, J. R. (2020). Linguo-social and cultural features of learning English. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (2), 408-412.
11. Suleymanova, N. M., & Nasrullaev, J. R. (2018). Nominativnie osobennosti yazikovykh edinic. *Molodoy uchenyj*, (7), 212-213.
12. Ismailov, A., & Nasrullaev, J. (2019). *The use of audiovisual devices in teaching technical courses in English*. In Science and practice: a new level of integration in the modern world. (pp. 147-150).
13. Nasrullaev, J. R. (2019). *Osushchestvlenie kommunikativnoy deyatel'nosti nazanyatiyah po chteniyu angloyazychnykh tekstov*. In Pyatyj mezhdunarodnyj intellektualnyj forum "Chtenie na evrazijskom perekrestke". (pp. 405-409).