

**ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF LINGUISTIC TYPOLOGY AND ITS
PRINCIPAL CONCEPTS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS**

Arabova Dinora Abdisamadovna*

*Karshi Institute of Irrigation and Agrotechnology,
Under "Tiiame" National Research University,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: dinora.arabova.91@bk.ru

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7315.2022.00173.3

ABSTRACT

The clearest cases are those where the parent language is known to exist. For example, on the basis of various words for “father” in the Romance languages, it is possible to see how they all derived from the Latin word “pater”. If Latin no longer existed, it would be possible to reconstruct a great deal of its form, by comparing large numbers of words in this way.

KEYWORDS: *Virtually Any Structural Feature, Morphology or Word-Structure, Morphemes, Languages and Establishes, Comparative Typology, Comparative Grammar, Confrontational Grammar, Descriptive-Comparative Linguistics.*

INTRODUCTION

One way of classifying languages is according to the genetic relationships among them; that is, according to their historical origin. However, we can also classify languages according to the kinds of structures they exhibit. Such a classification is typological, and a typological classification is, in principle, entirely independent of the histories of the languages involved—though languages which are genetically rather closely related, naturally, are often also very similar typologically.

In principle, we might pick on virtually any structural feature and use it as the basis of a classification. For example, we could divide languages into those in which the word for a canine animal is [d] and those in which it isn't. (The first group here would contain exactly two known languages: English and Australian language.) But such a classification would be pointless, since it wouldn't lead anywhere.

The only typological classifications which are of interest are those which are fruitful. By this we mean that the languages in each category should turn out to have other features in common, features which were not used to set up the classification in the first place. For example, we might classify languages into those which have tones (like Chinese and Yoruba) and those which don't (like English and Japanese). But this isn't very fruitful, since neither the tone languages nor the non-tone languages turn out to have much of anything else in common, apart perhaps from an interesting geographical distribution, with tone languages concentrated in east Asia and west Africa. Another possibility is to classify languages according to their morphology or word-structure. In the early nineteenth century, Wilhelm von Humboldt tried this. He classified languages into three types: isolating (a word typically consists only of a single morpheme, as in Vietnamese or classical Chinese), agglutinating (a word typically consists of a neat linear sequence of morphemes, all clearly recognizable, as in Turkish or Swahili), and inflecting (a word typically consists of several morphemes which are tangled up together in a messy way and cannot easily be separated, as in Latin or Russian). While famous, and possibly descriptively useful, this classification too has failed to be very fruitful, though it was later developed further by Edward

Sapir, who proposed several numerical indices for characterizing word structure in some detail.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The word typology consists of two Greek morphemes: a) typos means type and b) logos means science or word. Typology is a branch of science which is typical to all sciences without any exception. In this respect their typological method is not limited with the sphere of one science. It has a universal rise. So typology may be divided into: non-linguistic and linguistic typology.

Non-linguistic typology is the subject matter of the sciences except linguistics.

Linguistic typology is a new branch of general linguistics, which studies the systems of languages comparatively, also finds common laws of languages and establishes differences and similarities between them.

In linguistics we may come across many terms as to the terminological nature of linguistic typology. They are: comparative method, comparative-historical method, comparative (or contrastive) linguistics, comparative typology, comparative grammar, confrontational grammar, descriptive-comparative linguistics and so on. The terms used in Russian and Uzbek are not exact either. But the most celebrated and fruitful of all typological classifications has proved to be one in terms of basic word order. Proposed by Joseph Greenberg in 1963 and more recently developed by John Hawkins and others, word-order typology has revealed a number of striking and previously unsuspected correlations. For example, a language with SOV order is highly likely to have modifiers that precede their head nouns, auxiliaries that follow their main verbs, postpositions instead of prepositions, and a rich case system for nouns. A VSO language, in contrast, usually has modifiers that follows their nouns, auxiliaries that precede their verbs, prepositions, and no cases.

According to the notion of comparison of linguistics phenomenon and the aim directed on we may classify linguistic typology into the following parts. a) genetic or genealogical typology, b) structural typology, c) areal typology and d) comparative typology.

Genealogical typology is a branch of linguistic typology which studies the similarities and the relationship between the related languages. It is applicate to the systems of genetically related languages. Genealogical typology developed from the comparative-historical linguistics dominated during the 19th century in Europe. It's origin was stimulated by the discovery of Sanskrit, the ancient classical language of India. The discovery of Sanskrit disclosed the possibility of a comparative study of languages. The concept of relative languages was confirmed by the existence in India of a sister of the familiar languages of Europe e.g. Sanskrit "mata" means "mother", in the accus case "matarum"

dvau - two

trayah - three

As ti - he is etc.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Before the discovery of Sanskrit European linguistics possessed very vague similarities for the current grammars built on the Greek model. They didn't set clearly the features of each languages. It is worth to mention that at the same time Sanskrit discovery gave rise to confuse notions of linguistic relation which lived for a brief time that European languages were derived from Sanskrit. But this opinion gave way to a correct explanation, namely Sanskrit, Latin, Greek, and others were later forms of one prehistorical language. Comparatists gave two kinds of classification of languages -genealogical and morphological. Genealogical classification deals with the family relationship of languages which descend from one common ancestor. It distributes languages into different families. Morphological classification deals with the classification of

languages according to their structural features instead of a genealogical origin. According to the morphological classification the languages are divided into:

Isolating (Chinese, Vietnamese, Japan, etc.),

Analytic (Russian, English, German, etc.),

Agglutinative (Turkish languages) and others;

Genetic typology compares the systems of languages in two ways: diachronically and synchronically. But in the second case genetic relationship is not taken into consideration.

Structural linguistic typology can be understood as a systematization of linguistic phenomenon from different languages according to their specific structural features.

Structural typological research makes it possible to establish some traits that are universal, unique and special.

Comparative typology is a branch of general linguistic typology. It deals with a comparison of languages. Since the end of 18th century, the chief concern has been to explain the nature of linguistic diversity. This was the focus of comparative philology and dialectology, and it led to early attempts to set up genetic and structural typologies of languages. Comparative method is a way of systematically comparing a series of languages in order to prove a historical relationship between them. Scholars begin by identifying a set of formal similarities and differences between languages and try to work out (or reconstruct) an earlier stage of development from which all the forms could have derived. The process is known as internal reconstruction. When languages have been shown to have a common ancestor they are said to be cognate.

The clearest case are those where the parent language is known to exist. For example, on the basis of various words for “father” in the Romance languages, it is possible to see how they all derived from the Latin word “pater”. If Latin no longer existed, it would be possible to reconstruct a great deal of its form, by comparing large numbers of words in this way. Exactly the same reasoning is used for cases where the parent language does not exist, as when the forms in Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, Welsh, etc., are compared to reconstruct the Indo-European form “pater”. How the reconstructed forms were pronounced is a matter debate; some scholars are happy to assign phonetic values to the forms and pronounce them as if they were part of a real language; others argue that the forms are little more than abstract formulae, summarizing the sets of correspondences.

CONCLUSION

In the XXth century a new science of linguistics appeared, which continually stressed the variety of languages in the world, partly in reaction against the traditions of the 19th century prescriptivism, where one language, commonly Latin, had been regarded as a standard of excellence. Since the 1950 s, the focus on diversity has been replaced by a research paradigm, stemming from the work of the American linguist Noam Chomsky (1928-), in which the nature of Linguistic Universals holds a central place. Chomsky’s generative theory of language proposes a single set of rules from which all the grammatical sentences in a language can be derived. The ‘rules’ of a genitive grammar have no implication of social correctness. They are objective descriptions of the grammatical patterns that occur. In order to define these rules in an accurate and economical way, a grammar has to rely on certain general principles - abstract constraints that govern the it takes and the nature of the categories with which it operates. These principles are conceived as universal properties of language - the properties that are biologically necessary and thus innate (natural).

REFERENCES

1. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Education. T .: 1997.
2. Satimov G. Comparative typology of English and Uzbek languages. T. 2000, 250p
3. Greenberg, J.H. (1974) Language Typology: A Historical and Analytic Overview (Janua Linguarum, Series Minor, no. 184), The Hague: Mouton.
4. Arakin V.D. Sravnitel'naya tipologiya angliyskoko i russkogo yazikov. M. 1974, 286 p.
5. Brown L., Gassell's New English Dictionary, 15th ed., Ox. 2001 - 1456p.
6. Kuddon J., Penguin Dictionary of literary terms, 4th ed. L. 1999 - 1204p.
7. MacMillan Dictionaryfor advanced learners, 2nd ed. L. 2007 – 1748p.