Comparative Methods in Linguistic

Veliyeva Susanna Raipovna
Assistant at the Jizzakh branch of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Abstract
The article reviews the history of the emergence, development and prospects for further application of the comparative method in linguistics. In linguistics, the comparative method is a technique for studying the development of languages by performing a feature-by-feature comparison of two or more languages with common descent from a shared ancestor, as opposed to the method of internal reconstruction, which analyzes the internal development of a single language over time.

Key words: Comparative method, comparison, comparison, comparative-historical linguistics, comparative linguistics, translation theory, language teaching, interlingual , interference.

I. INTRODUCTION

Comparative linguistic, a cognitive science, owes its formation to the two scientific disciplines: cognitive linguistics and contrastive comparative linguistics. first one, though it does have century-old mentallinguistic prehistory, is on the stage of rapid scientific research now in terms of a new categorical-conceptual context; the other, having been for many years in a state of stable dynamics, has also entered a phase of intensive development. Ordinarily both methods are used together to reconstruct prehistoric phases of languages, to fill in gaps in the historical record of a language, to discover the development of phonological, morphological, and other linguistic systems, and to confirm or refute hypothesized relationships between languages.

II. MAIN PART

The comparative method is a set of techniques, developed over more than a century and a half, that permits us to recover linguistic constructs of earlier, usually unattested, stages in a family of related languages. The recovered ancestral elements may be phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, etc., and may be units in the system (phonemes, morphemes, words, etc.), or they may possibly be rules, constraints, conditions, or the like, depending on the model of grammar adopted. Is due to the fact that global humanitarian science, in general, is experiencing an anthropocentric attraction that cannot do without such fundamental categories for linguistic, cognitive science as linguistic consciousness, the mentality of the people and culture. Identification of these categories, in its turn, requires the proper linguistic way of explication, description and lingvo cultural interpretation of us, comparison of the speech material in order to identify general and specific semantics of the compared languages is viewed through the prism of the spiritual values, mentality and ethnic culture represented in it (Malykhina et al.: 2017). Comparative semantics of the post-Soviet period of the science of language has proved to be especially popular for several reasons: a) there is anincreasing interest in the ethnolinguistic identification of selfdetermined peoples; b) the formation of a new Eurasian space stimulates the development of inter-ethnic relations, cultural and economic contacts between peoples, and provokes an increasing interest for a cultural and cognitive understanding of a linguistic picture of the world, which is "an image, produced by the centuries- old experience of the people and carried out by means of linguistic nominations, of all that exists as an integral and multi-part world…"

The techniques involve comparison of cognate material from two or more related languages. Systematic comparison yields sets of regularly corresponding forms from which an antecedent form can often be deduced and its place in the proto-linguistic system determined. In practice this has

nearly always involved beginning with cognate basic vocabulary, extraction of recurring sound correspondences, and reconstruction of a proto-phonological system and partial lexicon. The matching method in linguistics is used to solve both theoretical and practical tasks. In linguistics, he received a certain recognition and development, which is reflected in a number of works. However, the term itself "Comparison" is interpreted in different ways, the meaning of the comparative method in linguistics, the scope and usefulness of its application are determined differently, which determines the interest in this topic. The comparative method (in comparative linguistics) is a method used to detect genetic relationships between languages and to establish a consistent relationship hypothesis by reconstructing:

the common ancestor of the languages in question,
a plausible sequence of regular changes by which the historically known languages can be derived from that common ancestor.

The comparative method is the "gold standard" by which mainstream linguists judge whether two languages are related; relation is deemed certain only if a reconstruction of the common ancestor (or at least a partial reconstruction) is feasible. Other proposed approaches, such as "mass lexical comparison", are considered unreliable by most linguists.

In linguistics, the comparative method is a technique for studying the development of languages by performing a feature-by-feature comparison of two or more languages with common descent from a shared ancestor and then extrapolating backwards to infer the properties of that ancestor. The comparative method, the most important technique in historical linguistics, is explained, together with its basic assumptions and limitations. The comparative method compares related languages in order to reconstruct the ancestral language from which they descend; thus it serves to show that languages are related, the basis of linguistic classification. The questions of how realistic its reconstructions are and how far back in time they can reach are considered.

The comparative method is the most important of the various techniques used to recover linguistic history. It is a method (or a set of procedures) which compares related languages, descendants from a common ancestral language, in order to postulate, to 'reconstruct,' the ancestral language. It is commonly considered a major event in the history of ideas; inspired by the success of the comparative method in linguistics, numerous other disciplines in the nineteenth century adopted comparative methods of their own. In this article the comparative method is explained and its basic assumptions and limitations are considered. How can languages be matched? What exactly are we comparing when comparing different languages? What is the unit of comparison? Comparative (contrastive) linguistics sets as its common goal the comparison of languages as a whole, including all language levels - phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic. One of the compared languages is sometimes called the reference language (or, as in translation studies, the source language).

Usually, this becomes the native language for the researcher (and the potential developer of applied applications of the research results). A certain (studied, etc.) foreign language (target language, Zielsprache) is compared with it. The similarities and, mainly, differences of the compared languages are highlighted. The comparison can be carried out in the direction from a foreign language to a native one. Sometimes a hypothetical intermediate language (mediator language) is modeled, which qualifies as a reference language. In such a model, the features common to the two languages are listed, and for each specific language it is indicated which of the features of the reference language are inherent in it. Such a model can be considered the first approximation to the theoretically postulated universal common human language. Comparisons of three languages are

possible. So, for example, as V.N. Yartseva points out, when teaching English in the conditions of the Bashkir school, it will be appropriate to indicate the similarities and differences between the Bashkir, Russian and English languages.

Comparisons of a larger number of languages are also possible, arising from the needs of building a general theory of language, linguistic contrasts, translation and intercultural communication. A universal language, taken as a standard in this case, is a scientific construct that "does not exist in nature" separately, but reflects the essential properties of all languages, or, in other words, the potentially possible properties of any language. Such a language, in fact, is a calculus of the possibilities of a human language, and the study of specific linguistic material, based on this construct, reveals both what has already been implemented in the system of a specific language (the center, in the terminology of the Prague school), and the embryos of possible future development (periphery) ...

he most effective way of comparative study of languages is the analysis of parallel texts. The study of statements with a similar content goes back to the comparison of canonical biblical texts and their translations into vernacular There are two main areas of research into parallel texts: experiment and observation. In the case of experimental 12 research, informants generate parallel texts as a reaction to the same initial situational stimuli. Such stimuli can be modeled in statements intended for translation (as, for example, in the studies of O. N. Seliverstova and others), either in describing a situation, or visually, by presenting, for example, a picture, etc. multilingual informants. Most often, texts generated in situational modeling are variants of translation (interpretation) of the initial situational stimulus into the same language.

They are also found in the reality of linguistic activity and literary creativity. An example is the texts of the four Gospels, in which the same events are recounted on behalf of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Retellings, parodies, reworkings of well-known texts (including intersemiotic translation, for example, of a literary text into the language of cinema) are also options for reinterpreting the initial situation by other linguistic means. If the task of the researcher is to study the variability not only in a single language, but also in translation, then the experimental method can also provide significant advantages. This method can also be used to compare translations in different languages. The method of observation, analysis of existing translations, and not specially obtained in the course of research, can be called a natural linguistic experiment, set by the very practice of linguistic activity (translation). The material is available translations of the same text into one or several languages, or versions of the translation of this text into one language, made by different translators. There are two ways to select material for parallel translations. You can use translations from one of the compared languages to another, and vice versa. In this case, the matching is always unidirectional; even if multiple language pairs are used, the result is a simple sum of individual bilingual collations. Such a study does not exclude the interfering influence of the original language, i.e. such a phenomenon when linguistic units and structures of the source language cause the use of similar units and structures of the target language. But it is also possible to use translations into comparable languages from a language that is not a special object of research.

At the same time, it is desirable that the source language be typologically dissimilar to the studied languages so that the linguistic phenomena under consideration are not reflected in the explicit grammar of the source language. This technique eliminates interference or minimizes it, and increases the "purity of the experiment." It is possible to develop this work further by extending it in the next step to the original language (temporarily "bracketed").

Such a way will allow identifying the categories of the hidden grammar of the source language, correlating them with the categories of the explicit grammar of the languages being compared, as well as with universal semantic categories, with universal semantic zones, and a universal inventory of grammatical meanings. Recurring correspondences or regularly recurring inconsistencies of parallel translations make it possible to draw conclusions about the division of universal semantic zones by the formal means of a particular language.

We can say that the method of parallel translations is the most economical method of comparing languages. A sample from a parallel text corpus must meet the criteria of quantitative and qualitative sufficiency. Qualitative sufficiency is understood as the coverage of various means of transmission of the phenomenon of interest.

The qualitative sufficiency of an individual statement in the corpus is associated with the vastness of the context in which the phenomenon of interest to the researcher was encountered.. With automated fitting, you can set the length of the right and left context required by the research tasks. Combinatorial grouping of the obtained material distinguishes groups according to the representation in multilingual translations of various grammatical, lexical and other phenomena, for example, group 1: in all translations the phenomenon x; group 2: in all translations - x, in language A - y; group 3: in all - x, in languages A and B - y, etc. The number of groups for two observed phenomena will be determined in accordance with the formula 2n, where n is the number of languages being compared. The quantitative comparison of groups already allows one to preliminarily determine the representation of the phenomenon under study in the compared languages.. The meaningful grouping first of all distinguishes the group of the interlanguage invariant (group 1: in all compared translations there is a phenomenon x), which is a kind of reference point for determining the central functional zone of the phenomenon under study. The next step is grouping by contextual components. This procedure allows you to determine the central and peripheral functional areas of the phenomenon x, types of contexts, restrictions on use, etc. At the stage of contextual analysis, the types of grammatical-contextual complexes, functional and situational types associated with this linguistic continuum, and the means of their specific linguistic implementation are established.. When using the method of parallel translations, a number of problems arise, the solution of which affects the result of the study.

 1. ***The problem of the material and the degree of adequacy of the compared translations***, i.e. the extent to which parallel texts selected as a corpus are indeed reactions to the same situational stimuli. Two negative factors can be indicated here: gaps in the competence of the translator and his change of point of view on the situation, in comparison with the original point of view of the author of the statement. Translations with a changed point of view on the situation, however, they are infrequent and may not be taken into account if the research objectives are associated, for example, with lexical or grammatical parallels. As for the competence of translators, evaluating it for a researcher means introducing another subjective point. In translation studies, however, the evaluation of a translator's "work" often becomes the cornerstone, and then "deviations" serve as the main research material.

 2. ***The problem of the representativeness of the corpus in the qualitative aspect.*** As a rule, translations are quite conservative: they tend to use central phenomena to a greater extent; to a lesser extent, peripheral phenomena, especially potential emerging ones, can be found in them. As a result, the dynamic aspect of linguistic activity escapes. The problem can be eliminated by using a double body in accordance with the principle of complementarity, i.e. in addition to parallel texts, use original, untranslated materials selected according to established criteria. Let us also admit the "shuttle method" using a number of corpuses (cf. A. Bell's approach).

3. The problem of quantitative representativeness. The hull selection principles may vary depending on the objectives and objects of research, but in any case, the use of a two-stage hull or shuttle method significantly reduces the amount of work. The second corpus is selected already taking into account the general picture, purposefully: it also includes statements containing phenomena that in one way or another contradict the picture revealed at the first stage or substantially complement it. The two-stage design makes it possible to study peripheral, low-frequency phenomena in a rather economical way.

4. The problem of the number of languages being compared. For research on universal grammar and functional typology, it is essential to attract material from as many languages as possible, which raises the question of the feasibility of such a study in general. On the one hand, some relief could be provided by computer processing of the material, especially at the stage of corpus selection, indexing and grouping. On the other hand, it is desirable to attract not so much more languages as languages - representatives of one type or another.

However, the implementation of the latter, the most optimal variant of the study, comes across the absence of a universal linguistic data bank, expressed, even if not in machine form, but at least in the form of an encyclopedic reference book.

Existing reference books of this kind suffer from incompleteness and contradictory principles of description. Often, typologically and even genetically related phenomena in closely related languages are described in them in contradictory terms, some of which testify to the author's recognition of the presence of a particular category in the studied language, while others used by another author to describe a parallel phenomenon in another language, talk about the denial of this phenomenon; sometimes this phenomenon completely falls out of sight of the author of an encyclopedic description, etc. This is where one of the most significant shortcomings of modern linguistics is manifested — the absence of a unified taxonomy (which was pointed out by BA Uspensky and many other researchers of linguistic typology).

However, the creation of such a taxonomy already presupposes the presence of certain knowledge about universals, i.e. we are dealing with a paradox noted by A. Bell: the optimal choice of languages or linguistic objects for research requires just the knowledge that is supposed to be obtained as a result of research. In this case, some pilot study is needed. Modern technologies have led to the possibility of studying large arrays of texts using special search programs. Corpus linguistics allows you to rely on an immeasurably wider base of texts. The British National Corpus (BNC, British National Corpus), the Russian National Corpus, and text corpora in a number of universities (Uppsala in Sweden, Tübingen in Germany, Leeds in Great Britain, etc.) are already widely known and used. You can use the full or (more often) demo version of the "services" of these repositories over the Internet. Parallel corpuses are also collected and available on the World Wide Web, although work in this direction has just begun, and the existing corpuses of parallel texts are insufficient (cf. University of Leeds, A. A. Kretov's corpus, translations of The Little Prince - so far - into 85 languages on the website Dr. R. Hemmecke and other examples).

If you were told to find out first-hand about the roots of a plant, you would be likely to go out into the garden, stand at the level of today's topsoil, and dig downwards. In this chapter, we tackle the apparently common-sense idea that to find out about the roots, or ultimate origins of languages, we should equally start from languages we know today and work backwards to their roots; and we show that this approach cannot work. First, the good methods we have for linguistic reconstruction (notably the comparative method) appear to be time-limited and cannot take us back far enough to be of evolutionary relevance.

There are less-constrained methods, but we cannot rely on their results. Second, and perhaps more important, any such method will necessarily be working at the level of behavioural, output

language structures, and we have seen that if we really want to talk about evolution, we need to get behind such superficial behavioural characteristics to the underlying physical and neurological structures, and ultimately to the genetic instructions which have configured them. We turn, therefore, from linguistic reconstruction to the comparative method in biology, and consider some similarities and differences between human language and aspects of other primate communication systems.

Genetically Related languages

In the present context, "related" has a specific meaning: two languages are said to be genetically related if they are descended from the same ancestor language. Thus, for example, Spanish and French are both descended from Latin. "Descent", in turn, is defined in terms of transmission across the generations: children learn a language from the parents' generation and are then influenced by their peers; they then transmit it to the next generation, and so on (how and why changes are introduced is a complicated, unresolved issue). A continuous chain of speakers across the centuries links Vulgar Latin to all of its modern descendants.

This definition of relatedness implies that even if two languages are quite similar in their vocabularies, they are not necessarily closely related. Modern Persian in fact takes more of its words from Arabic than from its direct ancestor, Proto-Indo-Iranian. This is because of heavy borrowing over the years from Arabic into Persian. But under the definition just given, Persian is considered to be descended from Proto-Indo-Iranian, and not from Arabic. The comparative method is a method for proving relatedness in the sense just given, as well as a method for reconstructing the proto-phonemes of a languages of a family and uncovering the phonological changes the languages of a family have undergone. Application of the comparative method in this case, it allowed to overcome interlingual interference, to strengthen the linguistic and cultural aspect of teaching foreign language, increase interest in learning, achieve better teaching results. Thus, comparative linguistics is an important branch of linguistics in which the method of comparison is widely used for solving linguistic and linguodidactic tasks. In comparative linguistics:

1. The language itself and each of its tiers is considered as a system;

2. Phenomena of language are considered in terms of synchronicity of their functions;

3. Contrasting differences are system and bilateral;

In addition to working on theoretical issues of linguistics, the comparative method has wide application in teaching and development of methods of teaching foreign languages, overcoming interlingual interference, building new methods of mastering all aspects of the language. The undeniable significance of the comparative linguistics and comparative method for theory and practice of translation, including machine translation. In modern linguistics, the comparative method is in demand and relevant.

References

1. ALEFIRENKO, NF (2012). Linguoculturology: valuable and semantic space of language.Moscow., ZS (2019). Social and ethnocultural components of a linguistic personality.
2. DENISOVA, LN, MASLOVA, AY & MOCHALOVA, TI (2017). "Ethno-linguistic representation of the semantic space of the word" dwelling" in the Russian dialects of the republic of mordovia." tomsk state university journal,45(420), pp.29-37

3.   GILQUIN, G (2017). "Applied cognitive linguistics and second/foreign language varieties: Towards an explanatory account." Usage-based Approaches to Language Acquisition and Language Teaching,

4.   . GOLDBERG, VB (2007). "Discussion problems of modern linguoconceptology (Tambov). Anthology of concepts in 5 volumes."Volgograd,pp.4-17.

5.   LEONTOVICH, OA (2000). "Time through the eyes of Russians and Americans: a comparative aspect. Language personality: problems of creative semantics."Volgograd,pp.72-78.

6.   LEVITSKY, AYE (2013). Linguoconceptology: promising areas.Lugansk. MALYKHINA, TM, LARINA, LI, PISAREVA, LE, PRAVEDNIKOVA, TV, KUZMINA, AV, KOSITSYNA, NO &STARODUBTSEVA, EA (2017).