OSCAR PUBLISHING SERVICES

Research Article

LINGUISTIC ECONOMY AND SYSTEMATIC CONSTRUCTION OF LANGUAGE

Rasulov Zubaydullo Izomovich
DSc, Docent, Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article provides general information about language phenomena, artificial intelligence and their connection with knowledge, thinking, memory, etc. In addition, the approaches and opinions of scientists on these topics are presented and explained with the help of examples. The author states that the movement of thinking and the formation of thought is associated with cognitive activity, a process that ensures the reflection of reality directly in the mind.

It is known that the formation of speech units and their understanding are the result of mental activity. The performance of this activity is directly related to the condition of obtaining linguistic knowledge. There is no way to know reality without linguistic knowledge, to lyrically express logical structures that reflect information about the current event-events. However, at the intersection of cognitive science, six fields of science are adjacent, and a single scientific goal is to be occupied with the search for a solution to the problems of concentration, processing and application of knowledge in natural and artificial systems. It seems-that interrelation between these areas does not take place in the same way, whereas, Artificial Intelligence and anthropological philosophy are directly related. Meanwhile, human cognitive activity should be considered not as a reflection of being as a mirror, but as a phenomenon that reflects the inner or outer essence of objects. The mental structure formed in the process of cognition – the content of the concept is occupied by character-features that have a clear appearance of exactly this type, and the same features lead in the linguistic reality of the concept.

KEYWORDS

language structures, cognitive activity, memory, language economy, communication, symbolic thinking, practical thinking.

INTRODUCTION

No doubt that the progress of linguistics does not go smoothly. But despite the fact that the directions and methods of analysis are changing, important features inherent in the language are continuously noted by all researchers. One such characteristic is the relationship of linguistic form and content, a statement that stands for the fact that ignoring it gives rise to unscientific conclusions. Another such necessary feature is consistency. Although some associate the formation of a systematic approach to language analysis with the science of the 20th century, but notes on the systematic relationships of language units are found in works created at all times. Even in Panini Grammar, where the grammatical construction of ancient Hindi – Sanskrit is described, linguistic units were systematically classified. In this work, just as in ancient treatises on other linguistics, systematic analysis was carried out within a separate level of language, units and forms of this level were partitioned, and they were distributed in separate groups. The classification method used for this purpose, unconditionally, is a general method inherent in all disciplines and, through its application, the use of objects studied.

The fact that a language has a systematic nature is not equally understandable. While L. von Bertalanffy, the founder of the general system theory interpreted the system as a "set of interrelated fragments" , F. de Saussure, on the other hand, views the linguistic sign as the product of the system . It can be seen from this that the system-structural approach has retained many aspects of the descriptive-classificatory approach, which is the paradigm of the previous study in its own right. Hence, language elements began to be imagined in the form of a device that was firmly isolated but located on interrelated levels. On this basis, within the framework of structural linguistics, language received the status of a stationary system, its role in human activity was ignored, and the description of linguistic units relied on the form.

German scientist L.Weisgerber, one of the representatives of this direction, opposes "form description-related" grammar (lantbezogene Grammatik) to "content-related" grammar (inhaltbezogene Grammatik) and encourages the need for exactly the second type of descriptive practice to lead in linguistics-related research . The scientist believes that any study of the language system should aim to determine the place of the native language in the life of society and its role as creativity. Only a grammatical analysis of the language is not enough to realize this goal, it is only going through the preparatory stage for future studies. It is from this point of view that L.Weisgerber divides the study of the language system into four phases: 1) the "external form" of language, i.e. sound-side analysis (die lantbaw, gestalbezogene); 2) content analysis (die

inhaltbezogene); 3) "language opportunity analysis", i.e. the effect of a linguistic phenomenon on the outcome of knowledge of the universe (die leistungbezogene; 4) "analysis of the possibilities of creativity of language", i.e. the effect of linguistic phenomena on life, human hatti movement (die wirkungbezogene Sprachbetrachtung).

L.Weisgerber notes that form cannot be abandoned in the early stages of linguistic analysis. Of course, formal analysis can be an intermediate stage for all directions. Therefore, the method of formal analysis can show its potential in relation to other areas of language research. He writes that "this method can directly relate to content analysis. In such an approach, we will try to determine the function of the separated form. This way of describing the essence of language, ultimately, allows us to determine in what form and function language manifests itself".

Thus, the result of studies carried out in the direction of systematization of linguistic phenomena by levels reports that an important way to illuminate the multiplicity of these phenomena is to describe the tasks they perform. However, language units are basically a binary phenomenon, which, in combination with having a certain shape (external), also act as a representation of one meaning or another. The speech reality of a language consists in the formation of structures that form a certain information from its elements.

Literature review

The fact that the language system consists of levels covering units of different character is recognized by all researchers. At these levels, the structure of language construction is reflected, and their separation sometimes becomes associated with the approach chosen by one or another linguist. In particular, if N.Chomsky approves to analyze the relationship of language levels from above, i.e., from syntax to bottom in the descending action, Émile Benveniste and his supporters, on the other hand, choose the opposite direction and recommend that the analysis go from sub - units to the upper-stage unit-gap . A.M.Mukhin, who covered in detail the problem of differentiation of the levels of the language system, encourages the need to separate constructive units on a single surface scale . As the scientist points out in one of his last works, the functional analysis of the elementary units of each line is an important resource when separating units belonging to different levels and defining their essence. In this case, it becomes clear that the lower levels serve as the basis for functional syntax.

Obviously, on the levels of the language, units of the same nature are concentrated, and they enter into syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between themselves. Step relations, on the other hand, exist between units belonging to different levels, and in this case the transition from the lower level unit to the

higher level occurs within the framework of syntagmatic relations.

Analysis

In modern linguistics, in addition to the phonetic, morphological, lexical, syntactic levels, the tradition of separating the text level as a phenomenon of a separate structural-semantic nature is strengthening. Moreover, as the text is made up of sentences, the sentence consists of lexemes, while the lexeme composition consists of at least one morpheme, the morpheme, in turn, decomposes into phonemes. The stepped structure in this view evidences that the levels of the language system have different natures, and such differences are reflected in inter-level relationships. As a result, changes in the language system usually occur in the "meeting" of these levels, influenced by intermediate relationships.

We consider that the principle of economy, which has a common character, can show its strength at all levels of language. But the means that ensure the manifestation of this principle can have a unique appearance at each level . It is functional linguistics that determines the movement, content and states of change of rules in the system. "In this approach," writes A.Frey, -... interpreting the facts, it outlines the tasks (satisfaction of need or emotion) that they are intended to carry out" .

It is natural that speech activity is accompanied by the observance of linguistic economy associated with the human organism, mental and physiological characteristics. This situation assumes to be economical at each language level and to use abbreviated forms with the capacity to express content in a concise and understandable way.

The question of the activation of the principle of economy on the lexical level of the language has been attracting the attention of linguists for a long time. In this matter, scientists, such as H.Paul, K.Brugman, O.Espersen, I.A.Baudouin de Courtenay, V.A.Many, Bogorodisky, contributed. However, lexical economy is among the phenomena that have existed in the language system for a long time. As K.Brugman shows , the contraction of compound words occurs in ancient India, that is, in Sanskrit: pasu – karam pasu or pasv – ijya. Meanwhile, the contraction of the attribute + noun was common in classical Latin. Shrinkage of proper nouns (nem. Fridrike is replaced by Rike or Frida; in English cases such as Becky instead of Rebecca or Lis instead of Elizabeth) are a remnant of the Indo-European languages primitive period.

Scandinavian linguist G.Stern believes that English lexemes such as "to shake", " to score ", "to leave", "fire" "short", "sound" are caused by contraction of such combinations as to shake hands, to score success, to leave school, to open fire, short of money, sound asleep .

DISCUSSION

Among the scientists who were among the first to put forward theoretical ideas about the role of the principle of economy in the evolutionary development of language, A.A.Potebnya can be a leader. According to the theory of this Ukrainian linguist, the language system develops continuously, and the violation of the old one continues with the creation of the new one. In addition, linguistic creativity never stops; along with the intensification of the practice of abstraction in the evolutionary development of language, the movement of describing concrete phenomena is also preserved. In the work of the scientist, although the principle of economy does not have the status of a term, but with the manifestation of phenomena associated with the phenomenon of economy on different language levels, issues are consistently discussed. On the problems listed above, the feedback expressed by A.Potebnya later found its place in the formation of a scientific theoretical description of the principle of economy.

During A.Potebnya's leadership in linguistics, attempts were made to simplify its composition in order to facilitate language education. This did not go without affecting the natural progress of the language, of course. Even, some researchers went so far as to come to the conclusion that "language tries from complexity to simplicity."

A language of a systemic nature is a device consisting of interconnected, overlapping parts. Its individual elements should be studied in the scale of the attitude towards each other and towards the holistic system. No matter how it looks, it is advisable to analyze linguistic phenomena in terms of the discursive tasks they perform. Already, in the process of communication, during discursive activity, the effect of the efforts to transmit and receive information, which is the main task of the language, is manifested.

In his time, A.Martine, who were ardent promoters of the law of economy expressed the view that "the term thrift covers all of the likes of eliminating useless distinctions, the emergence of new distinctions, and the maintenance of existing states". But R.Budagov, commenting on this conclusion of the French scientist assures that there is no place in linguistics for these types of generalizing concepts. His argument is that it is wrong to relate the concept of "economy" to quantity because, otherwise, this concept is blurred by phenomena in linguistics such as the differentiation of linguistic meanings, the stagnation of previous meanings, the occurrence of polysemy.

CONCLUSION

Each person who has the status of a separate socio-biological being has his own specific method of speech activity, that is, an idiostyle. Researchers who have analyzed the psycholinguistic basis of this

phenomenon distinguish two aspects of it. First, the idiostyle demonstrates the model of the author's speech activity, in which the transformation of language units into elements of aesthetic value is ensured. Secondly, in the idiostyle, conceptual content of a certain appearance is realized. The nature of the idiostyle is known in the fact that linguistic changes, variants are justified. In our opinion, the individual style conditions the balance of linguistic economy and redundancy within the norm.

REFERENCES

1. Safarov Sh. Cognitive linguistics. –Jizzak, 2000.

2. Rasulov Z.I. The Role of the Context and Situation in Intertextuality. Web of Semantic. Universal Journal of Innovative Education. Volume 2 Issue 5, Year 2023. ISSN: 2835-3048

3. Ludwig von Bertalanffy . General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications. G - Reference,Information and Interdisciplinary Subjects Series. George Braziller, Incorporated, 2015. -295 p.

4. Соссюр де Ф. Труды по языкознанию. –М.:Прогресс, 1977. –С.154.

5. Weisgerber L. Grundzüge der inhaltbezogeneu Grammatik. –Düsseldorf: Pädegogischer Veil. Schwan, 1962. -267s.

6. Émile Benveniste. Le sorgenti segrete di un linguista poliedrico. Edizioni ETS, 2021. -142 p.

7. Мухин А.М. Лингвистический анализ. Теоретические и методологические проблемы. –Л.:Наука, 1976. –С.30.

8. Мухин А.М. Функциональный синтаксис Функциональная лексикология. Функциональная морфология. –С.Пб.: Нестор-История, 2007. – С.106-107.

9. Фрей А. Грамматика ошибок. –М.:КомКнига, 2006. –С. 23.

10. Brugmann K. Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. –Strassburg, 1904. – S.292.

11. Stern G. Meaning and Change of Meaning. – Göteborg,1931. -P. 273.

12. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=BMFYYzIAAAAJ&cstart=20&pagesize=80&citft=1&citft=2&citft=3&email_for_op=zubaydullorasulov%40gmail.com&citation_for_view=BMFYYzIAAAAJ:hMod-77fHWUC