Language in Modern Linguistics

Tatyana Anatolyevna Bushuy [1]

Abstract: The research reveals the problems of studying general linguistics from the perspective of highlighting the linguistic picture of the world. The identification of essential features and trends in the development of the lexico-semantic system is investigated. The object of the study is to identify the features of the systemic organization of the language in terms of changes in the language structure.

Keywords: linguistic continuity, dialectical associations, synchronic and diachronic linguistics, hierarchically connected subsystems, heterogeneous systems, mechanism of change.

At the beginning of the XXI century a holistic theory of language has developed on the basis of various synthesizing and aspecting concepts that have absorbed the achievements of the philosophical and linguistic thought of its time and previous eras. This theory can rightfully be considered systemic.

The systemic nature of any existing language is undeniable. However, the questions of the specific features of the language system are still not developed. This is due to the unusual nature of this system, its fundamental difference from other types of systems studied by specific sciences, general systems theory, philosophy or typological philology.

One of the features of any language is its stability. It determines the purpose of the language to be the most important means of communication between people. However, being stable, the language is constantly in motion [A. Arlotto 2008: 24]. It undergoes changes due to extra- and intralinguistic factors. On this occasion, I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay remarked: "In language, as in nature in general, everything lives, everything moves, everything changes. Calm, stop, stagnation – an apparent phenomenon; this is a special case of motion subject to minimal changes. The statics of a language is only a particular case of its dynamics, or rather kinematics" [A. Adamska-Sałaciak, 2001: 204]. When characterizing the synchronous state of the language, "it is necessary to reckon with the fact of the presence, on the one hand, of surviving forms inherited from the past and no longer corresponding to the given general structure of the language, on the other hand, phenomena that foreshadow. It is the future state of a given tribal or national language that may not yet be suitable for the modern construction of this language" [A. Adamska-Sałaciak, 2001: 204].

Over time, linguistic changes reach such proportions that the reincarnation of "one language system into another" occurs [E.D. Polivanov 1968: 75]. At the same time, of course, the process of change does not equally affect different levels of the language system. The lexical subsystem is most sensitive to these changes. This is especially evident in the era of radical transformations of society. Therefore, the differences between the language systems of generations adjacent in time relate primarily to lexical and phraseological changes.

As a social system, language is distinguished by its substantial character and the way in which its elements exist in time [A.M. Bushuy 2013: 73]. The real system of each given language (= the objective correlate of the abstract language system) manifests itself only within the boundaries of the totality of all linguistic acts carried out by all members of the corresponding linguistic community throughout the historical period of its existence, inaccessible to concrete individual perception. The real language system is a partial system, since it does not have an independent, self-sufficient existence and is only one of the features of human society, one of the aspects of its activity.

---

[1] Doctor of Philological Sciences, professor of SamSIFL (Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages)

As a social system, language is distinguished by its substantial character and the way in which its elements exist in time [A.M. Bushuy 2013: 73]. The real system of each given language (= the objective correlate of the abstract language system) manifests itself only within the boundaries of the totality of all linguistic acts carried out by all members of the corresponding linguistic community throughout the historical period of its existence, inaccessible to concrete individual perception. The real language system is a partial system, since it does not have an independent, self-sufficient existence and is only one of the features of human society, one of the aspects of its activity.

The systemic organization of the language is manifested in such plans as: 1) physical-material, 2) substantive-content, 3) functional-distributive, 4) social-distributive, 5) subordinate (concrete languages as subsystems of large language systems), 6) integrative (language as a partial system is a specific subsystem of the integral system of society). All these plans are interconnected and influence each other [S. Bean 2008: 28].

The most relevant for the linguistic theory of the modern stage is the study of the factors and patterns of development that are common to each individual language and represents the main historical trends in interlingual interaction.

The development of the language system is manifested in 1) a change in the degree of intensity of its functioning and 2) a change in the degree of its internal unity. The expansion and complication of the functions of the language and the associated strengthening of the interaction and interconnection of its system components (i.e. raising the level of system organization) means progress in the development of the language. The narrowing and reduction of the functions of a particular language (accompanied by the weakening of its internal system connections) means the regression of this language as a special moment in the general process of development and interaction of the languages of the world [T.A. Bushuy 2018: 65; T. Bushuy, K. Khayrullaev 2022: 23].

The causality of the development of the language is determined by its internal and external contradictions, the relationship of changes in the internal structure of the language to its functions (from the perspective of people's communication and expression of thought).

There are three main types of changes in the structure of the language: 1) the formation and development of new classes of linguistic facts, 2) the replacement of some classes in the corresponding functions by others, 3) the directly uncompensated loss of classes of linguistic facts.

Such changes are overwhelmingly progressive in any normally functioning language. However, it is not the sound and formal structure of the language that develops and progresses in such way, but social and linguistic activity in reality. For a real system of language this progress means not only any replacement of its elements, but mostly an expansion of boundaries and an increase in the ways of forming elements. This ensures further strengthening of the internal unity of the language system, the relationship and interaction of its components and levels [U. Ammon 1999: 10; A.V. Faleeva 2023: 541; E.V. Faleeva 2022: 70;].

At each separate adjacent stage of linguistic continuity, only partial (hardly perceived by the native speaker) changes in the language system occur. As for noticeable shifts in the language system (leading over time to its significant transformation), they are the sum of partial changes that accumulate in the history of several generations, several stages of the successive transmission of the language from generation to another. The possibility of transmitting a language from one generation to another is achieved by the statically dominant nature of the "processes of linguistic continuity" over the dynamics of development [E.D. Polivanov 1968: 76].

As can be seen, the concepts of static and dynamic in the language (being relatively independent) are dialectically united. Being in opposite positions, they are at the same time interconnected and interdependent. Therefore, it is fair to say that stability (so necessary for the language to implement the function of communication) includes not only the statically determined stability of linguistic elements, but also the preservation of the process of change in the language [Bushuy T. 2010: 48; Bushuy T., Safarov Sh. 2007: 172].

In the relationship between synchronic and diachronic linguistics, it should be borne in mind that the system of any language consists of hierarchically connected subsystems (phonological, morphological, word-formation, etc.), each of which, in turn, has a complex structure and, therefore, also has a multi-stage hierarchy of subsystems of higher and lower orders. Each of these hierarchies allows for an exhaustive synchronic description and optimal diachronic study, identification of statics and dynamics, etc., because within the boundaries of each of the subsystems, the existing structural elements are in complex correspondence and relationships, i.e. have a systemic character.

Many linguists defend precisely the position of the system of relations in the language in his glossematic theory. Real linguistic units are by no means sounds or written signs and not meanings; real linguistic units are the elements of correlations represented by sounds or signs and meanings. The essence is not in sounds or signs and meanings as such, but in the mutual relations between them in the speech chain and in the paradigms of grammar. It is precisely these relationships that constitute the language system, and it is this internal system that is characteristic of a given language in contrast to other languages, while the manifestation of language in sounds, or written signs, or meanings remains indifferent to the system of language itself and can be changes without any damage to the system.

In general, a relatively isolated study of individual subsystems of different ranks should necessarily be perceived as one of the moments in the study of the general system of a particular language, which is one of the open, dynamic, heterogeneous systems. The openness of the language system lies in the fact that it does not function in isolation from society, but develops together with the development of society and human thinking, based on experience and practice (unlike biological, cybernetic and other systems).

The language system is open to thought. It has meaning. Other systems do not have it and therefore are closed. At the same time, it is important to take into account the following notion (from LDEI): "the main task of specialized theories of the system is the construction of specific scientific knowledge about different types and different aspects of the system, while the main problems of the general theory of the system are concentrated around the logical and methodological principles of system analysis, the construction of a metatheory of system research" [LDEI 1989: 285].

The openness of the language system is found at all levels. It is especially noticeable at the phonetic-phonological and lexico-semantic levels, which enable the penetration of foreign structural elements (borrowing of sounds and lexico-semantic elements).

The dynamism of the language system is expressed in the fact that it historically changes. Therefore, the synchronous analysis of the language does not fully reveal its essence. Indeed, the dynamism of the language system is found in the opposition of speech activity and linguistic traditions, manifesting itself in the form of the potential for the emergence of new properties, shades and characteristics of the original building units [R. Anttila 2010: 124].

Accordingly, the openness of the language system is manifested in the fact that the language system is potential, because it is only partially implemented in the current norm of the language. The openness that manifests itself in potentiality is explained not only by what is present in the language, but also by what is only possible in it. In other words, there is no language that has exhausted its possibilities. Otherwise, it would cease to satisfy society as a means of communication and as a spokesman for new phenomena in it. It is openness that makes it possible to use the language to convey all kinds of innovations, to clarify and concretize the available means of the language and, thereby, to enrich them.

At the same time, in order to reveal the mechanism of potential changes in the language, their causes, intensity and trends, it is important not only to point out one or another stage in the renewal of the language, but to develop a certain system of criteria by which it is possible to establish the degree of probability of shifts in the language.

Such a criterion, for example, is the compliance/non-compliance of innovations with the trends in the development of the language. Innovations that coincide with strong trends therefore become neoforms.

Moreover, innovations that do not coincide with the strongest trends have no prospect of staying in the language.

From the foregoing, it seems relevant to consider the systemic patterns of language development in such perspectives as: language in the conceptual picture of the world; word and semantic organization of the language; categoriality of linguistic meaning; multilevelness of the language system and derivational-normalized bases of the word and phraseological unit.

References

1. Бушуй Т.А. Основы современной теории контрастивной фразеографии // Вестник ЧелГУ. 2010. №29. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osnovy-sovremennoy-teorii-kontrastivnoy-frazeografii (дата обращения: 31.08.2023).

2. Фалеева А.В. Лексико-Семантические И Деривационные Особенности Коллоквиальных Акронимов И Бэкронимов В Современных Печатных И Электронных Лексикографических Источниках //Miasto Przyszłości. – 2023. – Т. 35. – С. 540-543.

3. Faleeva E.V. CURRENT STATUS OF ENGLISH NEOLOGY //МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ЯЗЫКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ, ПЕРЕВОДА. – 2022. – Т. 3. – №. 3.

4. Adamska-Sałaciak A. Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's contribution to linguistic theory // Towards a History of Linguistics in Poland: From the Early Beginnings to the End of the Twentieth Century. – Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001. – P. 175–208.

5. Ammon U. Dialect and Standard in highly industrialized societies. – The Hague: Mouton, 1999. – 155 p.

6. Arlotto A. Introduction to Historical Linguistics. – Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2008. – 514 p.

7. Bean S. Symbolic and Pragmatic Semantics. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008. – 470 p.

8. Bushuy A.M. Language in the conditions of industrialization of society // Davlat tili: muammo va echimlar. – 1 son. – TDYuI, 2013. – P. 73-77

9. Bushuy T., Safarov Sh. Til qurilishi: tahlil metodlari va metodologiyasi. – Toshkent: Fan, 2007. – B. 165-173.

10. Bushuy T. A. THE EMERGENCE OF LANGUAGE MULTITUDE //Scientific reports of Bukhara State University. – 2018. – Т. 1. – №. 3. – С. 62-67.

11. Bushuy, T., & Khayrullaev, K. (2022). LIFE OF WORD DURING CORONAVIRUS. Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры, 2(8), 19–28. извлечено от https://in-academy.uz/index.php/ejsspc/article/view/2613

12. Longman Dictionary of English Idioms. – London.: London Group Ltd, 1989. – 387 p. [LDEI]

13. Polivanov E.D. Articles on General Linguistics. – M.: Nauka, 1968. – 376 p.