

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

Mahkamova Shahlo

MA student, Uzbek State World Languages University

Abstract: The article describes issues related to studying the development of comparative linguistics in the post-independence period of Uzbekistan. As well as, we studied the essence of comparative linguistics and its significance in developing linguistics. Comparison of languages has theoretical and practical value. It deepens the study of each of the compared languages, contributes to the discovery of properties that remain out of sight in a separate (non-comparative) study. The results of such studies can serve as material for typology, for compiling dictionaries, as well as for the theory and practice of translation.

Keywords: linguistics, comparative linguistics, typology, language material.

INTRODUCTION

Comparative study of languages contributes to the solution of a number of practical problems: a) diagnosing the difficulties of the language being studied, arising as a result of interlingual discrepancies; b) selection of language material for teaching; c) determining the sequence of presentation of educational material; d) the choice of effective teaching methods for explaining the educational material; e) creation of rational exercises aimed at removing interlingual interference; f) determining the objects of control of skills and abilities of speech in a non-native language; g) creation of effective tests; g) explanation of common mistakes; h) creation of effective textbooks, teaching aids, methodological developments, programs in a non-native language.

The outstanding Soviet linguist L.V. Shcherba, on the very first pages of his work "The Next Problems of Linguistics" wrote: "One of the main immediate tasks is the comparative study of the structure, or system, of various languages. We really are facing a huge linguistic problem of primary importance" L. V. Shcherba, 1942, 39-40/. This article was first published in 1945. Since then, typology has made great strides, and significant progress has been made in the field of comparative historical linguistics and comparative linguistics.

MATERIALS AND ANALYSIS

The last two decades are characterized by the increased interest of linguists and methodologists in comparative linguistics. A huge number of studies on the comparative study of languages have appeared, several bibliographic works have been published, for example, Delieva 1974; Shishova 1975; Tim 1969; Hammer, Rice 1965; Zabrocki 1973; Mieszek 1977 and others.

In a number of countries (USA, England, Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary) special centers have been set up and a number of international congresses have been held, where questions of the comparative study of languages are being worked out.

In our country, a significant number of works have appeared on the comparative study of Russian and national languages, Russian and foreign languages, national and foreign languages: 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), G. Khashimov (1982), 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].

This interest in comparative linguistics is due to a number of reasons. First, it is the growing role of the English language in our multinational country and throughout the world.

Thus, comparative linguistics has a close relationship with typology and the practice of translation, sociolinguistics, lexicography, and methods of teaching a non-native language.

The future non-native language teacher should not only be fluent in this language, not only know its structure, but also clearly imagine those aspects of the non-native language that bring together or, conversely, distinguish this language from the native language, anticipate facilitation and interference, know ways to overcome the latter.

Therefore, lectures and practical classes in the course "Comparative typology of the native and studied languages" should be subject to these goals.

Despite the growing interest in comparative linguistics, this direction is still not mentioned in most books on general linguistics. One can note a certain number of linguists who openly oppose comparative linguistics and question its scientific and practical value / see, for example, Kewmark 1970; Ritchie 1970/. This situation is explained by the fact that at present the theoretical foundations of comparative linguistics are still insufficiently developed, although certain successes have been achieved in this area over the past two decades. The Turkologist A.N. Kononov wrote: "Currently, the comparative study of these languages is quantitatively developing very vigorously, however, qualitatively it is far from meeting the general interest in this important problem. Numerous attempts - comparative studies have been written in almost all Turkic languages grammarians - with inexorable logic they convince that a simple comparison of the factual material of two languages without a precisely and deeply developed special technique for comparing two languages of different systems does not and cannot give encouraging results".

If we consider a grammatical action on the time axis, in the process of its implementation, we can observe a) the stage of a sign that has not yet been used, b) the stage of intentions and choices; c) the moment of use, when the sign is combined with its situational meaning; d) i – the stage of an already-used sign, the stage of understanding and interpretation, rethinking. Rethinking, by the way, can be repeated. Language as a human phenomenon is generally possible due to the repetitive combination of intentions and interpretations, any subsequent intention is based on previous interpretations, on a kind of 'memory of the sign'.

The individuality of languages is especially evident in phonetics. The system of Uzbek vowels is much simpler: there are 6 phonemes in Uzbek.

If there are 5 vowels in Russian and in English 6, they are 19 in German.

When studying the typological features of the morphological layer (e.g. Germanic languages),

first of all, analytical indicators are considered.

An integrated structural typology relies on the delimitation of separable (with the lowest degree of syntactic dependence) and indivisible (with the highest degree of syntactic dependence) languages.

The procedural approach to the analysis of the dynamics of the development of grammatical events involves the distinction between morphological and syntactic categories.

The concept of grammatical categories within the framework of grammatical description is analyzed in the integrity of form and content. Absoluteness of the phenomenon of inconsistency between the form and content of language symbols.

Significant changes in the grammatical system of the language from a typological point of view include the phenomenon of syncretism.

Similarly, the typology of syntax construction can also be more effective in comparative learning of languages.

The search for comparative criteria has become one of the most pressing tasks for typological linguistics. Creating a model that can serve as a benchmark for language comparisons not only satisfies the requirements of universality, but also limits important distinguishing features from those that are less important.

The greatest difficulty in creating typological syntax is that, in general, a sentence cannot be a sufficiently precise and rigid unit of comparison. In languages with different structures, even the basic features of a sentence and the type of grammatical expression of the subject and predicate relations can be significantly different.

The functional application of word classes depends on the structure of the sentence by the formation of syntactic groups - word combinations through the combination of these words. It is therefore advisable to choose a structure that has both formal and functional features and is smaller than the sentence for typological comparison.

It is possible to analyze the structure of word combinations based on morphological categories and lexical-grammatical classification of language vocabulary. In typological analysis, it is more useful to compare 'subsystems' where individual phenomena of language are interconnected rather than individual facts.

The further development of comparison and linguistic typology will largely depend on the solution of a number of important general theoretical problems in language analysis. One of these is the problem of ambiguous application of the concepts of 'opposition' and 'comparison' in linguistics and other disciplines, where 'system' is understood as a series of oppositions or a series of connections and relations. A way out of this situation can be achieved by equalizing opposition and ties.

A relationship is a special state of a relationship and any relationship requires a relationship, but any relationship is not a relationship either. When there is a connection between elements, a change in one element leads to a change in the other (cause relationship). In the case of a relationship between elements, changes in the properties of one element do not lead to changes in the properties of another element. In this case, only the relationship will change. Because relationships do not exist without the properties of the elements. As a result, communication manifests itself as a type of relationship between elements with common functions.

Based on the above considerations, it can be concluded that lingvotypological opposition is not a system attribute (indicator) but a structural attribute and a possible way and model of its modeling.

Although traditional linguistic research has developed comparative methods (comparative linguistics), it is mainly used to demonstrate family relationships between related languages or to describe the historical development of one or more languages to help solve practical problems of

modern contrasting linguistics to show what aspects of the two languages differ in order to give. (Sometimes the terms diachronic linguistics and synchronous linguistics are used to refer to these two perspectives.)

Contrast linguistics, since its inception in the 1950s by Robert Lado, has often been associated with aspects of applied linguistics, such as the prevention of interference in the study of foreign languages, supported by Di Pietro (1971) [; 1] (see also Contrast Analysis) in the process of facilitating interlingual translation, as shown by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), texts from one language to another [2] and more recently by Hatim (1997) [3] (see translation) and Heltai (1988) show that finding lexical equivalents in the process of compiling bilingual dictionaries. [4] and Hartmann (1991) [5].

Contrasting descriptions can be at any level of the linguistic structure: speech sounds (phonology), written characters (spelling), word formation (morphology), word meaning (lexicology), collocation (phraseology), sentence structure (syntax) and complete speech (textology). The various techniques used have been shown to be relevant in corpus linguistics intralingual and interlinguistic contrast studies, e.g. with “parallel-text” analysis (Hartmann 1997). [6]

Contrasting linguistic research can also be used in the differential description of one or more varieties within a language, such as styles (contrasting rhetoric), dialects, registers, or terminology of technical genres.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it should be noted that the main technique of comparative linguistics is the comparison of the lexicon of two or more languages using methods such as phonological systems, morphological systems, syntax. In principle, any difference between two interrelated languages can be highly convincing; systematic changes are expected to be very regular (consistent), for example, in phonological or morphological systems. In practice, the comparison may be more limited, e.g. lexicon only. In some ways it may be possible to reconstruct an earlier proto-language. Although proto-languages reconstructed by the comparative method are approximate, reconstruction can have predictive power. The most striking example of this is Ferdinand de Saussure's suggestion that the larynx, which has an Indo-European consonant system, is a type of unconfirmed consonant in the Indo-European languages known at the time. The hypothesis was confirmed by the discovery of Hitt, who proved that Saussure had the voiceless voices he hypothesized in the environment he predicted.

Where languages originate from very distant ancestors and thus are more closely related to each other, the method of comparison is less practical. [2]

References:

1. Di Pietro, RJ (1971) *Language Structures in Contrast*, Newbury House.
2. Vinay, JP and Darbelnet, J. (1958) *Stylistic Comparée du Français et de l'Anglais*, Dide-Harrap.
3. Hatim, B. (1997) *Communication across cultures. Translation Theory and Contrasting Text Linguistics*, University of Exeter Press.
4. Heltai, P. (1988) "Contrast analysis of terminological systems and bilingual technical dictionaries", *International Journal of Lexicography* Vol. 1 (1) Pages 32-40.
5. Hartmann, R.R.K. (1991) "Contrast Linguistics and Bilingual Lexicography", in *Woerterbuecher / Dictionaries / Dictionaries*. Edited the International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. F.J. Hausmann et al. (Vol. III, pp. 2854-2859), De Gruyter.
6. Hartmann, R.R.K. (1997) "From Contrastual Textology to Parallel Text Corpus: Theory and Guidelines," in *Language History and Linguistic Modeling*. Edit Festschrift for Yatsek Fisiak. By R. Hiki and S. Puppel. De Gruyter.