Section 5. General questions of philology and linguistics

IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH THE METHODOLOGY IN LINGUISTICS

Muhammadjon Abduraxmanov [1]

[1] Department of English Language Teaching Methodology
Namangan State University, Uzbekistan y

Abstract

This article explores how linguistics study language, the different ways linguistics figure out how languages work and how they have evolved over time. It mentions the challenges young linguistics might face when trying to study language in a clear and organized way. It goes into the larger idea of how we approach studying things in science and how our understanding of the world affects our research methods. The article uses philosophy and other fields to explain how we perceive reality and how this affects what we know. It also touches on how we observe things and why that is so important in studying language. Overall, it emphasizes that to truly understand language, we need to look beyond surface-level facts and make meaningful connections between different aspects of it.

Keywords: *Linguistics, Research Methods, Methodology, Language Analysis, Scientific Research, Philosophy, Epistemology, Knowledge Acquisition, Perception, Reality, Observation, Language Evolution, Self-Organization, Objective Truth, Synergetics, Young Linguistics, Complexity, Linguistic Reality, Language Construction, Cognitive Activity*

Introduction

Science is the continuous accumulation and growth of knowledge, with each field of study relying on its own unique set of research methods to forge its path forward. Linguistics, examine various aspects of language, using a complex toolkit of methods to analyze it. These methods form the foundation of linguistics analysis, serving as the scaffolding upon which the science of linguistics built. The concepts of "method" and "methodology" share their origins in the Greek word "Methods" meaning the way to something. They describe how we go about studying a subject. However, simply having methods isn't enough; we must also have a theoretical framework, a "Doctrine" or "Theory" represented by "Logos" to guide our inquiries. In

linguistics, this framework is known as linguistics methodology, and it defines the key ways and methods through which we understand the complex reality of language.

Over centuries, linguistics have developed a vast array of methods to analyze language, each offering a different perspective and serving unique goals. This diversity of approaches can lead to challenges and inconsistencies in scientific research, especially for young linguistics eager to navigate the complexities of language. Sadly, comprehensive literature on linguistics analysis methodology remains limited, leaving aspiring linguistics with uncertainties and obstacles as they delve into the intricacies of language.

This article aims to shed light on the broad spectrum of research methods in linguistics and the foundational principles of linguistic analysis methodology. We will explore how scientific analysis distinguishes itself from everyday knowledge and delve into the tools and methods unique to scientific knowledge acquisition. Furthermore, we will discuss how the choice of research methods shapes the researcher's approach and how philosophy plays a pivotal role in defining the sources of knowledge. Furthermore, we will highlight the significance of observation as a fundamental tool in scientific research and the role of induction and deduction in analyzing linguistic phenomena. We will also touch upon the critical process of hypothesis formation and the necessity of idealization and abstraction in the pursuit of understanding complex linguistic realities.

Materials and Methods

Historical linguistics, the study of language evolution and development over time, has its roots in eras of humanism and the Renaissance. During the 17th century, scholars like J. B. Vico significantly contributed to linguistic understanding, setting the stage for the linguistics fervor of the 18th century (Fahey, 1995).

In the period, a surge of interest in European languages emerged, prompting orthographic reforms to align letters with sounds and a focus on sounds' analysis. While early grammars explored language components, the tradition of analyzing word groups persisted. Moreover, increasing international interactions broadened the spectrum of studied languages.

At that time, scholars contemplated the origins of languages, often proposing monogenetic views and suggesting ancient Hebrew as the "Ancestral language". Attempts to identify protolanguages, like Djambari's exploration of Florentine dialect's connection to Etruscan, were made. Comparative analysis began to take shape, notably with Caninisus highlighting Semitic language kinship.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, notable linguistics such as Bacon and Scaliger discussed language and thought relationships philosophically. Scaliger's typological classification based on the word "God" forms was influential. Meanwhile, the concept of D. B. Vico, outlined in his work "New science", presented a theory of language origin, proposing stages of language development from imitations of sounds to structured word groups (Fahey, 1995).

Researches of this era sought normative rules governing language use, primarily examining Latin, French, Greek and ancient Hebrew. Discussions revolved around features common to all languages, often focusing on categories like agreement, notably influenced by Latin. Despite disagreements, these early linguistics laid the foundation for further comparative historical studies.

The historical linguistics of the new era highlighted a vibrant and evolving landscape of linguistic inquiry, marked by exploration into language origins, classifications, and typologies. The theories and contributions during this period set the stage for modern linguistic scholarship, offering valuable insights into the roots and development of language.

Observation is the simplest way to learn about the world. In science, observation is the act of perceiving the state and characteristic of an object in its natural environment. Observation allows us to get preliminary information about the object, but it only gives us information about the external appearance of events. This can lead to random results and unreliable conclusions.

Science requires us to know reality based on internal, legal, and necessary connections. Experiment-testing one of the main means of cognitive activity that helps us achieve this. It allows us to re-check and test the results

of observation. However, the results and conclusions of experiments are also based on primary data, and they need detailed scientific analysis.

Introduction and deduction are intellectual tools of knowledge that are applied in all field of science. Introduction is a generalization of the results of separate observations. A cognitive activity is directed from precision (reality) to abstraction. Inductive reasoning seeks systematization from experience, discovery of empirical laws from systematized evidence, and scientific conclusions.

Deduction is a method of knowledge that is directed from the general to the specific. It is the opposite of induction. By means of deduction, the researcher creates specific knowledge about each of them from the general knowledge about a class a genus, a group of things or events.

In modern philosophy, inductive and deductive tools are interpreted as methods of mental analysis that provide interrelated, heuristic activity. The question of which of these methods are appropriate to use is directly related to the difference between two stages of scientific research: the empirical stage (gathering evidence, facts) and the theoretical stage (drawing scientific conclusions).

Empirical research is the first step in which evidence is gathered and systematized through simple observation or experience. The main research method used for this purpose is induction. However, in these cases, inductive analysis takes the form of hidden deduction to a certain extent, because the implementation of this analysis requires taking into account the integrity of reality and the generality of its relationships.

In theoretical analysis, a different approach is taken. This line of analysis draws conclusions about individual phenomena of reality based on specific concepts and principles. Inductive and deductive methods of knowledge are related to analysis and synthesis. Analysis is the act of dividing an object into parts in experience or thought and determining their properties. Synthesis is the opposite of analysis. It is the act of gathering the parts and features separated by the method of analysis into a whole.

A hypothesis is a holistic idea of the internal relations of parts and pieces of the subject being studied. These relationships are imagined before experience, and based on logical recognition, we are able to predict and interpret reality in advance.

Taking into account that certain phenomena can have infinite and constantly changing properties, the possibility of studying all the characteristics of all types of private phenomena in the same way is limited. For this reason, there are idealization or approximation (lat.–approximation) operations in the fields of science. By means of this action, a hypothetical object (more precisely, the concepts of this object) that does not exist in real existence is mentally formed. Concepts formed with the help of idealization can later be widely used as a reflection of a real object in conducting research, reasoning, and creating abstract schemes of real processes. Researchers have been widely using the opportunity to collect reliable information about real events because of the creation of idealized objects.

The act of idealization of the object of research is carried out in cooperation with the act of abstraction and logical experiment. One of the most common types of abstraction is simile. In the abstraction associated with equalization, we "Forget" some individual characteristics of the observed objects, look for commonality in them, and based on these common signs, we accept them as the same, even sometimes a single object.

The beginnings of historical linguistics can be traced back to the Humanist and Renaissance eras, the 17th century, the work of Giammbattista Vico (1668–1744), and the ideas of the New Age (Leerson, 2012).

During this period, there was a great deal of interests in the study of European languages. Many orthographic reforms were implemented, and there was a growing focus on sound.

Linguistics also began to study a wider range of languages, due to the development of international relations. The leading theory of language origin at the time was monogenetic, which held that all languages descended from a common ancestor language, often thought to be ancient Hebrew.

There were also attempts to identify the photo language, or ancestor language, of specific language families. For example, some scholars tried to show the relationship of the Florentine dialect to the Etruscan language,

while others believed that Adam's language was Teutonic (i. e, Flemish).

Ideas about the similarity and kinship of languages were also often confused. True comparativism began to take shape in Europe after Marcus Hutter published his work on the kinship of the Semitic languages.

Other notable linguistics of the New Age included Francis Bacon, Julius Caesar Scaliger, and Francesco Sanchez. Bacon analyzed the relationship between languages and thought from a philosophical point of view, while Scaliger is considered the "Ideological father" of classic grammar works.

During this period, the foundation for further comparative historical studies was laid. Linguistics such as Vojl and Menage began to talk about the use of language based on normative rules that do not obey logical laws. They also tried to identify features common to all languages, but their list of languages was limited to Latin, French, Greek, and ancient Hebrew.

An important figure in the linguistics of the New Age was Giambattista Vico, the author of the work New Science. In this work, Vico proposed a theory about the origin of languages. He argued that languages developed from imitations of sounds to exclamations to word groups. Vico also proposed three stages of language development: "Language of the Gods", "Heroic or Peotic" language, and "Epistolary" popular language (Leerson, 2012).

Vico explained the existence of different languages of different peoples with differences in weather conditions, customs, and times. While Vico's views were not influential comparativisties, he did make a significant contribution to Italian culture in the fields of literature, stylistics, and aesthetics (Leerson, 2012).

Comparative-historical linguistics is a field of linguistics that studies the relationships between languages and their historical development. It is based on the idea that languages can be compared to each other to find similarities and differences can be used to reconstruct the history of the languages.

The early development of comparative-historical linguistics is associated with the work of Franz Bopp and Jacob Grimm. Bopp is credited with founding the comparative-historical method in 1816 with is book.

Comparative analysis of the conjugation system in Sanskrit with the conjugation in Greek, Latin, Persian and Germanic languages (with exact and metrical translations from the original text of some passages of the Ramayana and Mahobharat and some parts of the Vedas). Rask and Grimm also made important contributions to the field.

In the 1850s, and 1860s, the comparative historical method was further developed by August Schleicher and Heyman Steinthal. Schleicher's main work, "Compendium of the Comparative Grammar of the Indo-European languages" (186–62), summarized the comparative historical study of Indo-European languages carried out during the previous 50 years. Steinthal wrote scientific works on the origin of languages, classification of languages and the history of linguistics.

The years 1870–1900 are known as "Young Grammarians period" in the history of comparative-historical linguistics. The Young Grammarians were a group of linguistics who believed that language was a historical phenomenon, and that sound changes were regular and irreversible. Some of the most notable Young Grammarians include Herman Paul, August Leskien, Karl Brugman, Herman Osthof, and Wilhelm Scherer.

In the early 20th century, comparative-historical linguistics began to expand beyond its traditional focus on Indo-European languages. Scholars began to study the relationships between other language families, such as the Afroasiatic, Dravidian, and Sino-Tibetan families. This expansions was due in part to the work of Franz Boas, who developed new methods for studying unwritten languages.

Comparative-historical linguistics is a thriving field of research. Scholars are working to reconstruct the history of languages all over the world, and to understand the processes of language change.

Comparative typology and translation are two disciplines that share common goals and methods. They both aim to identify similarities and differences between languages, and they both use inter-level analysis and cross level comparison.

Comparative typology is interested in the theoretical implications of comparing languages, while translations is more concerned with the practical application of this knowledge.

However, both disciplines can benefit from each other's insights (Baker, 2011).

One way that comparative typology can inform translation is by helping to identify the laws of adequacy between different language system. This information can be used by translator to develop strategies for overcoming the challenges of translating between languages that have different structures and features.

Another important contribution of comparative typology to translation is its focus on the role of interference in the language learning process. Interference is the negative influence that one language system can have on another language system when a person is learning a new language. By understanding the different types of interference, translators can develop strategies for helping learning to overcome these challenges.

Comparative typology and translation are two complementary disciplines that can offer valuable insights to each other. By working together, these disciplines can help us to better understand the nature of language and to develop more effective strategies for translation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the process of gaining knowledge about the world and understanding languages involves various methods and approaches. Empirical research, which relies on observation and induction, is a fundamental step in gathering evidence and systematizing information. However, in theoretical analysis, a different approach is taken, drawing conclusions based on concepts and principles, often involving deductive methods.

Inductive and deductive methods are closely related to the processes of analysis and synthesis. Analysis involves breaking down an object into its parts to determine their properties, while synthesis is the opposite, bringing these parts together to understand the whole.

Hypothesis play a crucial role in advancing knowledge, as they provide a holistic idea of how different parts relate within a subject. These hypotheses are formed based on logical reasoning and can be tested and confirmed through research. When supported by evidence, hypothesis can develop into scientific theories.

Idealization and abstraction are tools used to science to simplify complex objects or concepts. These processes allow researchers to create mental models or concepts. These processes allow researchers to create mental models or concepts that may not exist in reality but help in understanding and studying real phenomena. Abstraction often involves finding commonalities among observed objects, leading to the acceptance of similarities.

Shifting our focus to the historical linguistics of the Humanist and Renaissance eras, the 17th century marked a period of great interests in the study of European languages. Scholars initiated orthographic reforms and delved into the analysis of sounds. The quest for language origins led to monogenetic theories, with ancient Hebrew often posited as "ancestral language". Attempts were made to identify protolanguages for specific language families, and true comparativism began to emerge.

In this linguistics exploration, figures like Bacon, Scaliger, and Vico made significant contributions. Bacon phisolophically analyzed the relationship between language and thought, Scaliger became a key figure in classical grammar works, and Vico proposed a theory of language development, highlighting three stages of linguistics evolution.

The foundation for comparative-historical linguistics was laid by linguists like Franz Bopp, Rasmus Rask, and Jacob Grimm, who developed the comparative-historical method. Later, "Young Grammarians period" saw further advancements, which scholars like Heman Paul and August Leskien exploring language as a phenomenon.

In the early 20th century, comparative-historical linguistics expanded its focus beyond Indo-European languages to other language families, thanks in part to the work of Franz Boas. This expansion continues today, which scholars worldwide reconstructing language histories and studying language change processes.

Comparative typology and translation, while having distinct goals, share common methods and can mutually benefit one another. Comparative typology helps identify the laws of adequacy and inadequacy between languages, aiding translators in overcoming challenges posed by different language structures. Additionally, it sheds light on the role of interference in language learning, allowing

for the development of strategies to support language learners.

In summary, the journey of knowledge acquisition and linguistic exploration involves a rich tapestry of methods, from empirical research and hypotheses to idealization and abstraction. The historical linguistics of past eras laid the groundwork for modern linguistic scholarship, while comparative-historical linguistics continues to unravel the mysteries of language evolution. Comparative typology and translation offer complementary insights, collectively advancing our understanding of language and aiding in affective communication across diverse linguistic landscapes.

References:

Baker, M. (2011). In other words: A coursebook on translation. – Routledge.

Baker, M. (1998). In other words: A coursebook on translation and text analysis.– Routledge.

Fahey, T. (1995). Giambattista Vico on language and education.

Hock, H. H., & Joseph, B. D. (2009). Language history, language change, and language relationship: An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics (2nd ed). Mounton de Gruyter.

Leerson, J. (2012). The rise of philology: the comparative method, the historicist turn and the surreptitious influence of Giambattista Vico. *The making of the humanities,*– 2,– P. 23–35.

Meillet, A., & Eska, J. F. (2013). Historical linguistics: Toward a twenty-first century reintegration. Cambridge University Press.

Nord, C. (2010). Translation as a purposive activity: Functionalist approaches explained. St. Jerome Publishing.

Tateo, L. (2015). Giambattista Vico and the psychological imagination. *Culture & Psychology,*– 21(2).– P. 145–161.

Trask, R. L. (2013). Historical linguistics: An introduction to study of language change. – Westview Press.

Contact: amuhammadjon@mail.ru