

About Methodology and Methods of Language Study

Khayrullaev Khurshidjon Zaynievich

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, SamSIFL, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Key words: *Analysis methods, method, modern analysis methods, traditional analysis methods, descriptive method, comparative-historical method, comparison method, structural analysis method, functional analysis, glossematics, transformation, active-passive transformation, applicative method, direct participants method, contamination, conversion method, fundamental structure, basic structure.*

As the history of linguistics testifies, in each period and in each region, the methods of language research can be chosen differently, determined differently depending on the purpose of the research. Naturally, this is primarily due to the approach to language. In Ancient Greece, language was considered as an element of philosophy, and its study was also conducted from the point of view of philosophical and logical laws. In ancient India, Arabia, and Central Asia, it was approached from the perspective of practical educational needs. In ancient times, when determining the material of language, its units and the laws of functioning, they were compared with each other, comparing and contrasting, existing similarities and dissimilarities were identified. In ancient times, work was carried out based on such methods. Methods of scientific language research.

This activity, which implies scientific knowledge of language, means "method of cognition, way of cognition, research, doctrine." The word (methods) expressing these meanings comes from the Greek word. It is observed that this word is used in science in a narrow and broad sense. In a narrow sense, it represents a method used for a specific purpose in a particular science, and in a broad sense, it represents a philosophical approach. As can be seen, in the broad sense of all sciences and in the general philosophical sense, this concept represents the path to cognition, explanation, and understanding of any thing or phenomenon in life and existence. This is common to all sciences in their approach to their object.

Since the general philosophical method applies to all sciences, it is equally relevant to all sciences. Each science has its own working methods. The basis of these methods is the general philosophical method. Therefore, the general philosophical method is called methodology.

Method, for a specific science, implies a special scientific method and provides a way to know and identify a specific phenomenon related to a particular science. Based on this, linguistics, like other sciences, has its own research methods. These methods have emerged, formed, and developed alongside the science itself due to various needs throughout its long historical development. Depending on the purpose and need, they can be traditional or formed as a result of the mutual integration of sciences in connection with the need to clarify certain modern problems. Accordingly, analysis methods are divided into traditional analysis methods and modern analysis methods. Method and methodology differ from each other. If the method requires a way to know the truth about a certain phenomenon, then the method is the researcher's own approach to the essence of the problem in this process. Throughout the development of science, there are many methods.

The term "traditional method" is applied to methods whose application, emergence, and period of activity are connected with the distant past, and whose operating principles continue accordingly.

One such method is the descriptive method. This method has been used in linguistics since ancient times. According to this method, the goal is to describe the image, description of the elements of the language system, their mutual similarity, coherence, contrast, material state, that is, physical appearance, functional properties. With the help of this method, the properties of phonemes, morphemes, words and other units, signs, segmental and supersegmental elements in the language are studied, and their peculiarities and differences are identified and described. Description of grammatical categories, functional meaning and the forms that express them, and other important lexical, grammatical, and phonetic-phonological problematic issues. Ancient periods of linguistics.

It is clearly seen that the materials containing information related to a particular science, for example, language, are descriptive in nature. It should be especially noted that the descriptive method has gone through a long and fruitful path of development. He served representatives of various scientific schools in clarifying many problems, illuminating complex issues, and finding answers to many questions. Throughout their work, linguists who studied the problems of linguistics based on the comparative-historical method also created works of a descriptive nature. It can be noted that the scale of application of this method has not decreased even today.

The comparative historical method is also one of the traditional methods. This method emerged to study the language of sources written in Sanskrit (ancient Indian language) in comparison with European languages. As a result of the identification of similarities in the study of the Indian language in comparison with European languages, in the 19th century, the comparative-historical method proved its effectiveness and acquired significance in science as a separate method. This method has a special place and significance in various stages of linguistic science in the past, as well as in modern linguistics. The purpose of this method is to determine the historical and current state of units of a particular language or related languages, or their equivalent, alternative factors, by comparing them. In research using this method, the same phenomena of at least two or more related languages are compared with each other. Their similarities and differences are identified.

Through this method, the identification of common and specific features of related languages makes it possible to know the patterns characteristic of the language group or language family to which they belong. Based on this, comparative phonetics, comparative morphology, and comparative grammar of at least two languages belonging to the language family to which these languages belong are created.

Linguists using the comparative-historical method note that the Indian and European languages originated from the same base language in the distant past. They consider the place and role of the comparative-historical method important in determining and proving this. Because in showing these bases, it is important to identify the word forms specific to the base language, their grammatical formants. This is carried out using the comparative-historical method. In this process, units or elements that have the same commonality in genetically related languages are selected for comparison.

In such comparisons, it becomes clear that genetic equality is based on phonetic and semantic equality. Phonetic equality is a functional equality based on the fact that sounds can be variants, in addition, they serve the same purpose in the formation of words. One of the important aspects in drawing conclusions based on sound equality is that the sounds that are the basis for considering phonetic equality must have variability not only in the word being compared, but also in other places. Otherwise, this equality can become arbitrary. This is theoretically incorrect. Phonetic equality alone is not enough for comparing facts in language. At the same time, it is important to pay special attention to semantic equality. Phonetically similar, close words can have different, even opposite meanings depending on the concept they express.

Apparently, according to the law of this method of analysis, the process of analysis is not completed by concluding with a conclusion limited to phonetic similarity or equality, but the main tasks include the analysis and determination of the semantic similarity or equality of the studied unit.

Another such method is the comparison method. This method embodies the goal of knowing and identifying similar and dissimilar aspects and features based on the comparison of units in the structure of two or more languages, other elements in them that do not have the status of a unit and a sign. The comparative method has its own effectiveness, in which the visual method has the ability to eliminate imperceptible, difficult-to-notice shortcomings. Words that are similar or close in meaning may have different, even opposite, meanings depending on the concept they express.

Its results and operating patterns are useful and effective for comparative study of the native language with other languages, distinguishing common and specific features in languages and developing methods for their assimilation. The results of research based on the comparative method are especially valuable in finding solutions to problems in translation. The need to create translation theory and develop this field today is growing even more than in other eras. To meet such needs, conducting research based on the comparative method is an urgent, important task. The role of the comparative method and the research carried out on its basis is important for the current period, when there is an increasing demand for the creation of comparative grammars, multilingual translation and explanatory dictionaries. Therefore, the use of this method in all aspects of the development of our science

Due to the development of linguistics, the interaction of sciences, the emergence of the desire to find solutions to the problems arising in them based on new approaches, the need of linguistics for methods that provide stronger, more precise, and more deeply scientifically based results than traditional methods of analysis of its problems has increased, and this situation is still very noticeable today. At the same time, the goal of widely and appropriately using the achievements of modern science and achieving the expected theoretical and practical results has significantly increased. This is due to the fact that social needs for linguistics are growing on a global scale from a practical point of view.

It is becoming clear that computer technology and its rapidly developing technical and technological capabilities are directly related to such needs. On this basis, the methods of analysis, which are the basis for meeting modern needs and the formation of modern methods, are collectively called modern methods of analysis.

One of such methods is the method of structural analysis. According to its essence and approach to language, this method approaches language as a whole structure of relatively different, but mutually distinct units. Some aspects of the structural method are similar to the descriptive method, which is considered one of the traditional methods. But they are fundamentally different from each other. Their similarity is manifested in the study of language units by both methods. In other words, the descriptive method describes language units based on their characteristics, while the structural analysis method examines the interconnectedness between language units. In addition, in the method of structural analysis, the fact that language and speech are different phenomena is taken into account, and this is fundamentally observed in the research process. This method of analysis was formed in the current of structuralism in linguistics and is applied to the study of the structural system of language and speech.

Each school of structuralism has its own characteristics. This is manifested in the fact that, although they have common views on language as a system consisting of signs, there are differences in some other opinions and views.

The Prague School of Linguistics, the Copenhagen School of Linguistics, and the American School of Structuralism are considered structuralist schools. In functional analysis, Prague linguistics sets itself the main task of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical analysis of language. At the same time, in the Prague School of Linguistics, the paradigmatic, syntagmatic connections of units, the description of relations within these connections, and the functional value of linguistic units were studied.

However, they also led to the unfounded conclusion that sounds distinguish meanings. In fact, they did not pay the main attention to the distinction of the sound shell of the words expressing these meanings, and not the sound meaning.

In Prague linguistics, issues related to the phoneme and its variants, the concept of an archphoneme, have been deeply studied. Such phenomena also had their value in describing morphological problems, and on this basis, the concept of archymorpheme was also substantiated. In the study of language units, special attention was paid to their opposition properties. In this case, strong and weak signs of morphological opposition were distinguished.

For example, in the Russian language, the word *учительница*, along with the concept of profession, also has an understanding of the gender of the owner of this profession. However, although the expression of the concept of gender along with profession is noticeable in the form *учитель* of this word, the absence of a formant expressing it is observed. This is evidence of the noted strong and weak opposition. According to the conclusions of this opposition, it can be noted that the scope of application of a strong opposition is narrow, and the scope of application of a weak opposition is relatively wide.

Representatives of Prague linguistics also had their own views on syntactic analysis. Accordingly, the relationship between theme and rheme is of particular importance in grammatical analysis. The part of the message already known to the participants of the dialogue - the theme, including the perceived novelty - the novelty of the message - was described as a rheme.

In the method of the representatives of the Copenhagen School of Structural Analysis, one can see that special attention is paid to each of the planes of expression and content of the language. The concept of the plane of expression implies the signifier, that is, the sound or the corresponding aspect of the language unit. The content side refers to the signified, that is, the thought formed through this unit. The plane of expression consists of substance and form. Analyzing language using this method allows for a clear distinction between phonemes, variants of phonemes, and allophones.

If a difference on one plane is associated with a difference on another plane, then each of the unities causing the changes is considered a separate unity. If the opposite is true, then it can be observed that variants of one unit are formed. Since the state in the given word corresponds to the second state, it is possible to observe variants.

Structural analysis methods have also developed separately in America. In this case, the analysis is based on transformation. It would not be an exaggeration to say that American descriptivism, one of the sources of modern world structuralism, was formed as a special school of linguistics. Indeed, it has spread widely not only in America but throughout the world with its scientific direction and ideas. In this school, first one of the methods of descriptive analysis of language material, the method of distributive analysis, was introduced, and then methods of direct participants and transformational analysis were introduced. Among the prominent representatives of American descriptive linguistics are Franz Boas, Eduard Sapir, and Leonard Bloomfield, who made a huge contribution to its formation.

Franz Boas dedicated his entire scientific career to the study of the languages of American Indians and Eskimos. Obviously, these peoples did not have not only scientific works, but also alphabets. Therefore, the scientific-linguistic methods created by the peoples of Europe could not be used to study and scientifically analyze their language. Therefore, Boas began his work by writing "A Guide to the Languages of American Indians" (1911-1922), and through this, he embarked on a great beneficial endeavor.

American scientist Edward Sapir's work "Language," published in 1921, also made an important contribution to the development of descriptive linguistics. In this work, Sepir scientifically substantiated that the development of language is connected with the standard of living of the people and the social status of the territory where this language is used.

Leonard Bloomfield's contributions to defining the main directions and principles of descriptive linguistics hold a special place. He provides extensive information about this in his work "Language" (1933). At the same time, it should be noted that Bloomfield gained great prestige in world linguistics through this work. This work still serves as one of the main sources of descriptive linguistics for linguists not only in America, but also in the world.

By the middle of the last century, the method of distributive analysis began to gain priority in America. The contributions of Z. Harris and other linguists played a significant role in this. Z. Harris gained fame with his work "Method in Structural Linguistics." The work was republished twice during 1951-1961.

In this study, in particular, the method of distributive analysis is comprehensively interpreted, and it is shown that it is especially important in the interpretation of phonological issues of language. For example, the question of whether a particular phoneme can or cannot come surrounded by other phonemes can serve as an example of this.

The transformational method was scientifically substantiated by American linguists R. Lees, Z. Harris, and N. Chomsky. In this regard, Z. Harris's work "Joint Meeting and Transformation in the Language Structure" (1957), N. Chomsky's "Syntactic Structures" (1957), and R. Lees's "What is Transformation?" (1961) is of great importance.

The transformational method has many advantages and advantages over distributive analysis and BI methods, and it is based mainly on the following principles.

It should also be noted that the phenomenon of transformation should not be understood as common to the concept of derivation. The concept of derivation is broad and includes the phenomenon of transformation (including BI analysis). In other words, the concept of transformation requires one of the working mechanisms of syntactic derivation. Another method of derivation is called the applicative method. The applicative method differs from transformation in that it is associated with the expansion of the sentence form.

As can be seen, the applicative method is characteristic only of syntactic derivation and is not subject to the conditions of transformation.

Another modern method of analysis is the method of mathematical analysis. Mathematical linguistics is a direction of scientific analysis carried out by the method of mathematical modeling of linguistics. In linguistics, mathematical linguistics is based on computer experiments. Mathematical linguistics in text analysis and methods of analysis based on its principles are widely used in world linguistics. Ferdinand de Saussure and I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay were the first to speak about this direction in the history of science. The method of mathematical analysis and its manifestations appeared in the history of linguistics in the 19th-20th centuries. However, both in the East and in the West, its foundations go back to the distant past. Because it is well known that in the declension, conjugation of words, the differentiation of meter in poetic and prose works, mathematical calculation, quantitative changes lead to qualitative changes, or conversely, quantitative changes do not affect the content.

In the stages of development of linguistics, it has also become clear that language units are realized in speech. A person also wants to imagine his speech in specific dimensions, to know not only its functional value in communication, but also in literal quantitative and material values. In this regard, the method of mathematical analysis is useful to a certain extent. The sound composition of the language, morpheme-morphological structure and features, syntactic units and grammatical rules that ensure the relationship between them testify to the unity of broad possibilities for the functioning of this method. If we observe the interrelationship of language and speech units, not all of the units contained in them are used in practice. In other words, some language units are used more often, while others are used less often. The significance of language units is clearly manifested in the state of their use in speech and the amount of use.

When determining the recorded and other similar properties of language signs, the theoretical set signs present in them, transformational signs based on logical algebra, and probability signs are used. In this case, the theoretical set symbols - set symbols, transformational symbols based on logical algebra - algorithmic symbols, probability symbols provide differentiation possibilities that can serve as a basis for reacting to them. In this case, the units taken for study form a set and are called a set. Analysis based on set characteristics stems from the relationship between the two parts of equivalence

and order. In this case, there is no limit on the number of elements of the set. Every unit included in the set is an element of the set.

As can be seen, analysis methods are important in their essence. Their existence and development are extremely important for the development and success of linguistics.

References:

1. Abduazizov A. Tilshunoslik nazariyasiga kirish. – Toshkent, 2010. (Abduazizov A. Introduction to the Theory of Linguistics. – Tashkent, 2020.)
2. Khayrullaev K. Z. The relation of word, word composition and sentence to the predicativeness //Abstract of candidate dissertation. –Tashkent. – 2001.
3. Pottier B. Introduction à l'étude des structures grammaticales fondamentales. – Nancy, 1966.- P.14.
4. Rasulov R.Umumiyl tilshunoslik. –Toshkent, 2013. (Rasulov R. General Linguistics. – Tashkent, 2013.)
5. Turniyozov N., Turniyozova K., Xayrullayev X. Struktur sintaksis asoslari //Samarqand: SamDCHTI. – 2009.
6. Амирова Т.А., и др. Очерки по истории лингвистики. –М.,1975. (Amirova T.A., et al. Essays on the History of Linguistics. – M., 1975.)
7. Балли Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. – М., 1955. (Balli Sh. General Linguistics and Issues of the French Language. – M., 1955.)
8. Бўронов Ж. Б. Инглиз ва ўзбек тиллари қиёсий грамматикаси. – Тошкент, 1973. (Bo'ronov J. B. Comparative Grammar of English and Uzbek. – Tashkent, 2021.)
9. Кондрашов Н.А. История лингвистических учений. – М., 1979. (Kondrashov N.A. History of Linguistic Studies. – M., 1979.)
10. Тилшунослик назарияси ва методологияси. Тузувчи: Ҳ. Дадабоев. –Тошкент, 2004. (Theory and Methodology of Linguistics. Compiler: H. Dadaboyev. – Tashkent, 2020.)
11. Тошкент, 1979. (Baskakov N.A., Sodiqov A.S., Abduazizov A.A. General Linguistics. – Tashkent, 2020.)
12. Турниёзов Н.Қ., Муинова К.А. Гап ва унинг структураси. – Самарқанд, 1985. (Turniyozov N.Q., Muinova K.A. Sentence and its Structure. – Samarkand, 2020.)
13. Усмонов С. Умумий тилшунослик. – Тошкент, 1972. (Usmanov S. General Linguistics. – Tashkent, 1972.)
14. Хайруллаев Ҳ. З. Сўз, сўз бирикмаси ва гапнинг предикативликка муносабати //Номзод. дис автореферати. Тошкент. – 2001.
15. Хайруллаев Ҳ. О лингвистической природе уровней языка и речи //Вопросы филологических наук. – 2009. – №. 2. – С. 78-79.
16. Хайруллаев Ҳ. Предикативлик ҳодисаси ва унинг ифода объектлари. – 2002.
17. Хомский Н. «Синтаксические структуры» // Новое в лингвистике, вып. 2. –М., 1962. (Chomsky N. "Syntactic Structures" // New in Linguistics, issue. 2. – M., 1962.)