

The Development of Comparative Linguistics in the Pre-Independence Period of Uzbekistan

Mahkamova Shahlo

MA student, Uzbek State World Languages University

Abstract: This article deals with the issues based on analyzing the development of comparative linguistics in the pre-independence period of Uzbekistan. The possibilities and necessity of using a contrastive approach in teaching foreign language teachers in modern conditions are described. Comparison of languages is one of the most important methods for studying bilingualism, which is especially important in the conditions of our country, an effective method for studying the interaction and mutual enrichment of languages. As well as, it can create a universal model or a universal metalanguage, with the help of which it is possible to establish the degree of proximity of languages, their similarities and differences, it can also provide general linguistics with new data.

Keywords: linguistics, contrastive approach, cognitive linguistics, teaching methodology, universal, comparison of languages.

INTRODUCTION

Comparative (contrastive) linguistics sets as its general goal the comparison of languages in general, including all language levels - phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic. One of the compared languages is sometimes called the reference language (or, as in translation studies, the source language). Usually, it becomes the native language for the researcher (and possible developer of applied applications of the research results). A certain (studied, etc.) foreign language (target language, Zielsprache) is compared with it. The similarities and, mainly, differences of the compared languages are highlighted. Comparison can also be carried out in the direction from a foreign language to a native one. Sometimes a certain hypothetical intermediate language (intermediary language) is modeled, which qualifies as a reference language. In such a model, features common to two languages are listed, and for each particular language it is indicated which of the features of the reference language are inherent in it. Such a model can be considered the first approximation to the theoretically postulated universal human language.

Comparisons of three languages are possible. So, for example, as V.N. Yartseva points out, when teaching English in the conditions of the Bashkir school, indications of the similarities and differences between the Bashkir, Russian and English languages will be appropriate. Comparisons of a larger number of languages are also possible, arising from the needs of building a general theory of language, language contrasts, translation and intercultural communication. The universal language, taken as a standard in this case, is a scientific construct that “does not exist in nature” separately, but reflects the essential properties of all languages or, in other words, the potentially possible properties of any language. Such a language, in fact, is a calculus of the possibilities of human language, and the study of concrete language material, relying on this construct, reveals both what has already been implemented in the system of a particular language (the center, in the terminology of the Prague school), and the embryos possible future development (periphery).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Comparison as a method of scientific knowledge has justified itself in many sciences. Linguistics

is no exception. The history of the comparison of languages begins, according to legend, with the "Babylonian confusion". However, at each stage of the development of linguistics, the method of comparative study of languages has its own characteristics. It is based on the theoretical foundations of linguistics of the period under consideration. At this stage, modern linguistic research is based on the achievements of cognitive linguistics. This fact naturally influences modern methods of comparative language learning. The task that the author set himself in this article is to highlight and analyze the relationship between the most significant general theoretical provisions of contrastive and cognitive linguistics. The data obtained can be effectively used for applied linguodidactic purposes, namely in the practice of teaching a foreign language in modern conditions.

The changes taking place in Uzbekistan require the addition of some provisions of the methodology of teaching a foreign language, which are associated with an increase in the multi-ethnic population of the country. One of the ways in this direction is the development of a new integrative special course for students of philological faculties, future teachers of a foreign language. Such a course, on the one hand, will help to take a fresh look at contrastive studies conducted earlier, on the other hand, it will equip students with the necessary knowledge for successful teaching of a foreign language.

At the current stage of development of linguistics, cognitive research has become an integral part of modern linguistic science. Unlike traditional linguistics, to which we refer contrastive linguistics, and which mainly observes, describes, states and classifies, cognitive linguistics performs an explanatory function.

Contrastive linguistics combines comparative and typological analysis of languages. It is a synchronous-comparative method of parallel linguistic description and analysis of two or more language systems and subsystems with the task of identifying the most significant differences, differentiating features against the background of an established basic similarity.

It is necessary to clarify the terminological apparatus adopted in this study, since there is still no terminological unity in theoretical works of a contrastive nature.

Typological research involves highlighting the common that is presented in all languages. In the study, the term "typology" will be defined as the doctrine of the types of languages that are studied by comparing both individual levels, sublevels and microsystems, as well as systems of individual languages in general and groups of languages. The principle of comparison in linguistics is represented by the methods of intralingual and interlingual comparison.

Researchers working in this vein were interested in the facts of the language, which are of a universal linguistic character, reflecting certain patterns of the linguistic structure inherent in all languages. Such patterns, common to all or most languages, are called language universals. The practical development of such universals was fruitfully engaged in by the well-known specialist in the field of linguistic universals B.A. Uspensky [6]. This type of universals refers to a greater extent to universals that characterize the language in a synchronous way. Such universals are called descriptive or absolute.

Language universals, according to B.A. Uspensky, can be determined on the basis of a direct comparison of languages with each other, i.e. in strictly linguistic terms. In this case, we are talking about linguistic typology [7].

Various types of comparison of language systems have been carried out for a long time. Any grammars of the second language being studied, like many of the first grammars of the native language, were written against the background of comparison, conscious or unconscious, with another language. Some researchers believe that Panini's grammar latently contained elements of a comparison of Sanskrit with colloquial Prakrits. The first grammars of the Renaissance period were actually written in comparison with the grammars of the Greek or Latin language. As rightly noted by V.G. Gak, "comparative linguistics grew out of the need to describe languages and from the need to teach them" [2,5]. Accordingly, there are numerous studies that compare

the phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical subsystems of the most diverse languages of the world. Back in 1904, F.F. Fortunatov wrote about the need to use comparison techniques, comparing the facts of the native language "with similar in a certain respect, but at the same time representing significant differences, the facts of a foreign language, which gives the teacher an indispensable tool to explain to students the grammatical phenomena of the native language" [8,68].

DISCUSSIONS AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Some researchers associate the emergence of contrastive linguistics as a science with the publication of R. Lado's book "Linguistics across Culture" in 1957.

Contrastive linguistics in Central Asia originates from the work of Mahmud Kashgari "Divanu lugatat-turk" (Dictionary of Turkic languages) and the work of Alisher Navai "Muhakamat al-lugatayn" (Judgment about two languages).

A certain role in the development of comparative linguistics in Uzbekistan was played by the work of E.D. Polivanov "Russian grammar in comparison with the Uzbek language" (1934). It, according to E.D. Polivanov himself, is considered "a differential grammar of the Russian language in relation to the Uzbek language" [5]. This work by E.D. Polivanov had a great influence on the further development of the comparison of languages of different systems.

A scientific comparison of the Uzbek language system with the systems of other languages of the world, with English, French and German, which are still the main foreign languages studied in schools and universities of Uzbekistan, was carried out. In the last three decades, individual national languages of the peoples of Uzbekistan have been compared with foreign languages for theoretical and practical purposes. Such works provided rich practical material for the methodology of comparative studies.

Comparative studies aimed at comparing specific languages include dissertations, monographs, textbooks and manuals of the following linguists: E.D. Polivanov (1934), A. Abduazizov (1967, 1974), M. Abdurazakov (1997), A.A. Abdullaeva (2003), Sh.A. Abdurakhmanov (1973), A.L. Abdurakhmanova (2004), A.I. Abrazhiev (1962), A.M. Avulov (1973), Yu. Aglaev (1978), A. Azizov (1960,1983), A. Azizov et al. (1965), F.I. Arslanov (1980), G.M. Ataeva (1990), H. Barnokhadzhaeva (1958), N.A. Bayazitova (1958), J. Buronov (1973), J. Buranov, U.K. Yusupov, M.A.Iriskulov, A.S.Sadikov (1986), M.M.Gadoeva (1989), J. Dzhusupov (1991), J.Yokubov (2005), N.Zufarova (1971), M.S.Ismatullaeva (1972), N.I.Kodirova (2001), N.M.Kambarov (1990), O.Kazhaeva (1991), B.A.Karimova (2003), Z.R.Karimova (1981), N.R.Karimova (1970), K. Kazhamov (1983), S. L. Kim (1986), I. A. Kisten (1952, 1979), P. Kurbanazarov (1985), A. Kurbanbaev (1992), A. G. Maksumov (1972), J. Matyakubov (1996), K. Meliev (1969, 2001), T. Mirsogatov, V. D. Musaeva (1986, 1989), K. Nazarov (1980), Sh. K. Namazov (1978), M. Nusharov (1974, 1976), O. Okhunov (1973), N. N. Panzhieva (2004), N. M. Pazilova (1991), E. E. Polivanov (1934), M.I. Rasulova (1998), H. Saitniyazova (1989), G. Salimov (1991), I. Saliev (1985), G. Kh. Satimov (1987), Z. Siddikov (2000), S. Soliev (1991), K. Taimetov (1969), Sh. Usmonova (2000), B. U. Uralov (1988), V. A. Fedorov (1973), M. Finkelstein (1980), A. Hamitova (1969), G. Khashimov (1982), Z. Khudaiberganova (1999), J. Shabonov (2000), H. T. Shadiev (1989), T. Ergashev (1989), O. Eshonkulov, N.K. Turniyazov (1982), U.K. Yusupov (1971), Kh. Yakubova (1964) and others. All of them deserve close attention and study, since each work makes a certain contribution to the theoretical development of comparative studies and teaching methods. V.G. Gak notes that the terms "contrastive grammar" and "contrastive linguistics" are imported from the English language, and in domestic linguistics the corresponding direction of language analysis was called "comparison of languages", "comparative grammar" [2,6].

In the undertaken study, we consider it expedient to use the term "contrastive linguistics" as a working term, since it is more understandable to students for whose training a special course was developed.

Among linguists, the question of the difference between contrastive linguistics and linguistic typology or their relationship has been discussed. The subject of comparative analysis can be a separate phenomenon, and not necessarily in two, it can be in several languages. Typological analysis can cover large sections of the language and even the structure of the language as a whole. The task of linguistic typology is to establish a linguistic type (both the types of existence of an element in various languages, and linguistic types in general), for the subsequent classification of languages and to identify how a human language can be arranged in general. The purpose of typology as a scientific method is to highlight the features that characterize the object of study, and to classify these features, as well as the object itself, according to the totality of the selected features.

The term "typology" itself is ambiguous. For example, S.G. Shafikov identifies four meanings of the term "typology" that exist in modern linguistics: 1) the branch of linguistics in which the typological (comparative) method is used; 2) the method of typological (comparative) study of languages; 3) classification of languages; 4) classification of the studied language units [10,7].

The purpose of typology as a scientific method is to highlight the features that characterize the object of study, and to classify these features, as well as the object itself, according to the totality of the selected features. The set of features that are characteristic of a group of objects, identified by the totality of some features, is called a type. Like typology, the concept of "type" is universal and is used in all sciences, including linguistic typology. A type is usually understood here as a set of certain linguistic properties or a set of languages that have them [10,75]. Type in the narrow sense of the term, or type of linguistic expression (type of linguistic element), a form of a universal or general linguistic phenomenon [2,8]. In this sense, they talk about types of articulation of sounds, types of phrases and sentences, types of syntactic connection and morphological expression, etc. Each function in the language can be implemented in different ways, and these ways of expressing the same "task" form types. Type in the broad sense of the term, or language type (language type), is a set of generalized features of the language as a whole [2,8]. In modern typology, the classification of languages recedes into the background, giving way to the classification of types as a more general goal of linguistic typology, which consists in characterizing languages.

From the point of view of typology and contrastive linguistics, in each language there are two types of properties - allomorphic (individual) and isomorphic (general). The former lead to a typological classification of languages due to the existence of individual features in languages, the latter to the identification of universal features (universals) [9].

In order to determine isomorphic or allomorphic features in several languages, it is necessary to compare these languages with each other or contrast one language with another. The scientific description of a language, the definition of its typology, will not be universal unless a standard is used that can be measured or compared with any language known to science. In the scientific literature, the standard language is understood in the most general form as a language for describing systems or phenomena of compared natural languages; in this case, it is usually indicated that the standard language can be both natural and artificial, representing in the latter case a system of parameters or description rules [10,110].

As a reference language, B.A. Uspensky proposed to consider amorphous languages, which, as he believed, have the simplest structure and in which the invariant relations common to all languages are most clearly and consistently expressed [7,132]. However, in reality, amorphous languages, as shown by N.N. Korotkov, in its structure is much more complicated than the ideal that the standard language should approach [3,41]. Therefore, attempts are currently being made to construct some kind of a priori language system that could act as a reference language.

It seems appropriate to distinguish between the concept of standard language and metalanguage, since this allows us to differentiate the deductive principle of the scientific apparatus of description and the inductive principle of extracting factual material.

The tasks of contrastive linguistics are the comparison of the facts of two or more languages in order to detect similarities and discrepancies. These are two interrelated approaches to the study of language material. They can be considered the initial stages of a hierarchical system for studying the linguistic features of individual languages or their groups. This approach to linguistic facts is more descriptive, considering languages in a synchronous cut of similarities and differences between them, i.e. is the study of language structures.

The next step in the theoretical study of languages is based on the achievements of cognitive linguistics, on new methods of working with linguistic material - the identification of general principles governing mental processes. The task of cognitive linguistics is to penetrate into the forms of these structures through the comprehension of the language and to describe the dependencies existing between them and the language. In this, according to N.N. Boldyrev, is the fundamental difference between cognitive linguistics and traditional [1,12]. There is a revision of traditional approaches to the study of languages, i.e. knowledge is changing.

CONCLUSION

Currently, in linguistics, there is an increase in the role of language in the processes of cognition of the world. The processes of storage and transmission of information from person to person are studied. The process of categorization is rethought. According to one of the leading cognitologists E.S. Kubryakova, the understanding of “the linguistic categories themselves turns out to be a kind of key to understanding the nature of the language” [4]. The issues of categorization are now being dealt with by cognitive semantics, which has put forward a new understanding of the category as a function of cognition.

All of the above leads us to a statement of the fact that linguistic research today is interdisciplinary in nature. A hierarchical system is being built, the basis of which is contrastive linguistics, and the next tier is cognitive linguistics. Both tiers are a symbiosis and have direct access to teaching methods, reducing a certain gap that exists between teaching methods and new theoretical developments.

References:

1. Boldyrev N.N. Kognitivnaya semantika. Tambov, 2001.
2. Gak V.G. O kontrastivnoy lingvistike. V sb. Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike. Vyp. XXV. Kontrastivnaya lingvistika. M.: Progress, 1989.
3. Korotkov N.N. Strukturnaya tipologiya, yazyk-etalon i zadachi obshchey teorii yazyka // Lingvisticheskaya tipologiya i vostochnyye yazyki. M., 1965.
4. Kubryakova Ye.S. Chasti rechi s kognitivnoy tochki zreniya. M., 1997.
5. Polivanov Ye.D. Russkaya grammatika v sopostavlenii s uzbekskim yazykom. Tashkent, 1934.
6. Uspenskiy B.A. Problemy universalii v yazykoznanii. V sb.: Novoye v lingvistike. M., 1970, vyp. Uspenskiy B.A. Strukturnaya tipologiya yazykov. M., 1965.
7. Fortunatov F.F. Sravnitel'noye yazykoznanie. Izbrannyye trudy. M., 1956. T.1. P. 68.
8. Shaykhmakhin A.M. Nekotoryye printsipy formalizatsii semantiki yestestvennykh yazykov. Avto-ref. dis. cand. phil. scien. M., 1986.
9. Shafikov S.G. YAzykovyye universalii i problemy leksicheskoy semantiki. Ufa, 1998.
10. Kashkin V. B. Choice Factors in Translation / V. B. Kashkin / Target. – 10 :1. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1998. – P. 95-111.