



STUDY OF THE LEXICAL SYSTEM OF THE LANGUAGE WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF TRADITIONAL LINGUISTICS

Jo'raboyeva Gulshanoy Baxtiyor qizi

O'zbekiston Davlat Jahon tillari universiteti

magistratura, lingvistika (ingliz tili) 2-bosqich talabasi

gulshanoybaxtiyorovna@gmail.com

<https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7947187>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 08th May 2023

Accepted: 16th May 2023

Online: 17th May 2023

KEY WORDS

Traditional grammar, early history of linguistics, antinomy, word meaning and form, etymology, onomatopetic words, sound symbolism, Anomaly regular model, verb class, Latin grammar, Thracian Dionysian grammar, cognitive metaphor, ontological metaphor, synthetic metaphor.

ABSTRACT

This article examines language facts in linguistics, Greek, Latin, Thracian Dionysian grammarians and their theories, analysis of different parts of speech, meanings in traditional grammar, familiarization with the theories of ancient and medieval philosophers, identification of etymological expressions and it includes issues such as studying the essence of their content, studying the figurative meanings of the word, considering the use of "metaphor" in the language and the interpretation of its function.

Linguistics is defined as the "scientific study of language" and includes both objective methods and empirically testable methods. They are based on a general theory of language structure. A young linguist cannot begin his science with the history of linguistics, without knowing the history of the emergence of linguistic ideas and concepts. This applies not only to concepts familiar from school, but also to concepts determined by logic.

According to L. Bloomfield, the specific intelligence involved in the consideration of language facts is based on the theories of ancient and medieval philosophers, and all languages have the same parts of speech. In traditional grammar, the meanings of different parts of speech are based on the theories of ancient and medieval philosophers, who in turn tried to unify the categories of grammar, logic, and metaphysics. Other equally common concepts arose not from philosophical considerations but from the use of grammar to interpret written texts, especially the classical works of Greek and Latin authors¹. With a foundation laid in the distant past, the history of linguistics lays the foundation for the rejection of false ideas about language and even refutes traditional theories, implementing them in accordance with new ideas. Therefore, in modern linguistics, as in other disciplines, there are positive examples of correct assumptions about language and negative examples

¹ Лайонз Дж. Введение в теоретическую лингвистику. М.: Прогресс, 1978. С.22



based on misconceptions. A number of contradictions and ambiguities that arise in the study of the early history of linguistics are explained, first of all, by the loss of ancient sources. Nevertheless, the evidence that has survived to this day allows us to trace the development of language teaching from Plato and the Sophists to the medieval scholastics, and demonstrates that this historical period gave the world many original grammarians. Like many other disciplines, traditional grammar appeared in ancient Greece in the 5th century BC and belonged to philosophy, which formed part of the general study of the nature of the world and public institutions. The main task of Greek philosophy relied on two approaches to determine how language functions in society. Some ancient Greek scholars believed that language was "innately" ordered, while others insisted that language was acquired by habit. In general, the antinomy "by nature" "by habit" occupied a leading place in the thoughts of Greek philosophers... In essence, eternal and constant, phenomena outside of man were considered to be regulated in nature. Based on these two approaches, it was concluded whether there is a necessary connection between the meaning and form of the word. Along with the proponents of a "natural" view of language, Cratylus believed that each word naturally corresponds to a certain thing². And although this connection is not always possible, it can be revealed by a philosopher who can see its essence. Thanks to such considerations, the first etymological phrases were defined, and the term "etymology" is derived from the Greek "etymo" meaning "true" and does not fully include the philosophical origin of the word. There are natural connections between the meaning of a word and its form. For example, words such as "thump", "thump", "whistle", "meow", "wow" imitate sounds and are to some extent characteristic of certain phenomena belonging to one group. The same words that imitate certain sounds, but do not mean the sound itself, but its source, for example, "cuckoo", form another group similar to the first. The connection between a word and its meaning is a "name", and words originally imitated designated objects and were considered onomatopoeic words. Initially, the nature of other words was compared with the individual sounds that are part of them. These sounds expressed the characteristics of objects or events. They are divided into: "Bold", "soft", "sharp", "liquid", etc. In this position, for example, the sound "r" was considered sharp, so "horn", "tear", "cut", "running", "army" it ("naturally") is based on their meanings. Modern linguistics interprets this relationship between the sound shell of a word and its meaning as sound symbolism³. Different techniques are used to distinguish words from each other or to study their related aspects. Such techniques are divided into two main types. The first involves establishing a "natural" correlation of literal and figurative uses of the word, for example: "the bow of a ship", "the back of a chair side", "leg of the chair", "neck of the bottle", etc. Like many other terms introduced by the ancient Greeks, the term "metaphor" entered traditional grammar and stylistics. Examples of the second type interpret the form of one word by adding, cutting, replacing sounds in other words that are similar in meaning. This technique was used by proponents of a naturalistic view of language, based on the idea of excluding all words of the language from the original selection of words of natural origin. Ancient Greek, like English or Russian (despite the fact that many word inflections

² Аристотель. Политика. Метафизика. Аналитика. М.: Эксмо, 2008. С.45

³ Радченко О.А. История лингвофилософской мысли. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2005. С.32



follow regular rules or patterns), has various exceptions. An example of such a rule in the Russian language is: "column - columns", "table - tables", "bridge - bridges", etc. Regularity and irregularity were defined in this sense by the terms "similarity" and "anomaly". The point of view of analogists was used by Plato, Aristotle and their followers in various fields. For example, on the basis of the ratio "table - tables", with similarity, you can see a number of word forms such as "bridge - bridges", "column - columns" and others. In ancient Greece, the dispute was not resolved because the Greeks had no idea of the difference between descriptive and prescriptive grammar, that is, between a description of what is actually said and an instruction on how to speak. Thus, rather than changing their understanding of the nature of language, analogists correct the apparent anomalies they encounter. Another reason that makes the debate between analogists and anomalists intractable lies in the way in which the phenomenon can be described as either regular or irregular. Any judgment about the regularity of language is based on one question: What is a "regular model"? Anomalists and analogists disagree about the extent to which disorder can be described using contrasting models and whether there is regularity in language. Later grammarians, who organized the early grammatical doctrines and thus created traditional grammar, affirmed similarity and anomaly in the language. It was not possible to solve the problem of analogy and anomaly, because with the desire to determine the regularity in the language, the researcher repeatedly encountered alternative methods of reference, and there were doubts about which of these methods should be applied. Despite the achievements of modern linguistics, this issue has not been fully resolved, and the disputes between analogists and anomalists have not ended. A study of the history of grammar includes a study of the basic tools of grammatical analysis provided by Greek scholars to describe their language. Even a cursory acquaintance with the history of the ancient Greek doctrine of language shows that the system of analysis accepted in the ordinary grammars of the Greek language was ambiguous. Its development lasted almost six hundred years (from IV century BC to II century AD). Furthermore, the method of description known as canonical Greek grammar was not universal.

Taking into account the above, we note that this definition of the main grammatical classes - nouns and verbs - is based only on logical grounds: According to this definition, the class of verbs includes words called verbs and adjectives. Later Greek grammarians rejected Plato's classification and replaced the now-accepted three-member verb-noun-adjective system with a two-member system in which nouns and adjectives are combined into one class, and words that do not belong to the main classes were not significant⁴.

According to Plato, nouns and verbs are separated in language. But he added to the existing third class—conjunctions—words not included in the two main classes. He also borrowed the system of three generations from his predecessors, and Protagoras also focused on the names of inanimate objects belonging to the third gender. In Greek, names of inanimate objects were either masculine or feminine. Therefore, he called the third gender "intermediate" (then he called the class of nouns of neither feminine nor masculine gender "neither" gender, and the Latin interpretation gave the name "neuter gender" used in

⁴ Гашимов Э.А. Лингвокультура потребностного кода: монография. М.: Пирсон Эдьюкейшн Лимитед, 2009.С.48



traditional grammar). Aristotle discovered the category of tense in the verb: he noted that some forms of the verb can be compared with the present tense, and others with the past tense⁵.

They also provided the concept of work with a meaning that later moved to traditional grammars, defined the "direct" case (nominative) and "indirect". The Stoics understood that for the Greek verb, in addition to the tense, the category of completeness and incompleteness of action should be emphasized. They also distinguished between real and passive forms of action in the verb. Verbs are divided into transitive and intransitive verbs. Alexandrian grammarians continued to develop the main ideas of the Stoics, and in Alexandria the so-called traditional grammar of the Greek language arose⁶. In both Greece and Rome, grammar was followed by philosophy, literature, and rhetoric. Disagreements about similarity and anomaly have not been resolved, and this issue has been considered by grammarians along with other grammatical questions of Greek doctrine. Proof of this is Julius Caesar's grammatical treatise "On Similitude" dedicated to Cicero.

Roman grammarians followed Greek views on both language and character. The Latin grammar, along with the Thracian Dionysian grammar, consisted of three parts. The first part was defined as the art of speaking and understanding poetry correctly, analyzing letters and syllables. The second part studied the parts of speech, their change in time, gender, number, case, etc., the third part considered style issues, warned about regular stylistic mistakes, suggested turns of speech. 'shown. The similarity of the structures of these languages confirmed the idea that the grammatical categories formed by the ancient Greeks (for example, parts of speech, case, number, time, etc.) are universal for the language as a whole. This idea is preserved in the works of medieval grammarians. The works of Donatus (AD 400) and Priscian (AD -500) belong to the last period of Roman grammar, which was dominated by classicism, as in Alexandria. In the Middle Ages, until the 17th century, Donatus and Priscian grammars, which were considered normative and used as textbooks in Latin, preserved the languages of Cicero and Virgil - the classical authors, and thus the "classical fallacy" in the general approach to language formation. Determining the explanatory potential of lexical units is largely related to their ability to perform a secondary nominative function. In the history of linguistic studies, the problem of describing interpretative meanings is the following theories of secondary nomination and secondary values (O. S. Akhmanova, N. D. Arutyunova, E. S. Kubryakov, V. N. Telia, etc.), from the metonymic point of view, and the metaphorical mechanisms of semantic derivation and the semantic potential of the word. installation (M. V. Nikitin) was considered.

Metaphor arose on the basis of simulative mental connection involving comparison as a mechanism of semantic derivation. M. V. Nikitin distinguished the following types of metaphors: cognitive (ontological: direct and transposed, synesthetic) and emotive. Cognitive metaphor, both ontological and synesthetic, indirectly, based on some similarity, seeks to show some features in the object of comparison itself. The emotional metaphor is related to

⁵ Юрченко В.С. Философия языка и философия языкознания: лингвофилософские очерки. Л.: ЛКИ, 2008.С.63

⁶ Лайонз Дж. Введение в теоретическую лингвистику. М.: Прогресс, 1978.С.24



the emotional evaluation of consciousness, moving from the cognitive plane. Lexical systems are network models of natural language lexicons. Unlike traditional textual dictionary-type models, lexical systems structure lexical information in an essentially relational way: each lexical unit is primarily a set of paradigmatic and syntagmatic links that connect it with other lexical units of the language. characterized by From a formal point of view, a lexical system is a graph of lexical units of a small world family, its structure is similar to a "social network of lexical units". It is therefore fundamentally different from taxonomic models, where the lexicon is primarily organized as a hierarchy of lexical item classes.

References:

1. Апресян Ю.Д. Формальная модель языка и представление лексикографических знаний // Вопросы языкознания. -1990. -№6, -С.123-140
2. Бойко Б.Л. Формы существования языка и текста // Методы сопоставительного изучения языков. -М.: Наука, 1988. -С.71-76
3. Болдырев Н.Н. Когнитивная природа языка: сборник статей / Н.Н.
4. Болдырев Н.Н. Интерпретационный потенциал концептуальной метафоры // Когнитивные исследования языка. Вып. XV. Механизмы языковой когниции: сб. науч. тр. – М.: Ин-т языкознания РАН; Тамбов: Издательский дом ТГУ им. Г.Р. Державина, 2013б
5. Болдырев Н.Н. Интерпретационный потенциал концептуальной метафоры // Когнитивные исследования языка. Вып. XV. Механизмы языковой когниции: сб. науч. тр. – М.: Ин-т языкознания РАН; Тамбов: Издательский дом ТГУ им. Г.Р. Державина, 2013б
6. Гумбольдт В. фон. Избранные труды по языкознанию. – М: Прогресс, 1984.
7. Кубрякова Е.С. Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке: Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. С.524
8. Kubryakova.V . Kognitiv atamalarning qisqacha lug'ati 1996, 93
9. Лайонз Дж. Введение в теоретическую лингвистику. М.: Прогресс, 1978. С
10. Павилёнис Р.И. Проблема смысла: Современный логико-философский анализ языка. – М.: Мысль, 1983.
11. Уфимцева А.А. Лексическое значение. – М.: Изд-во Академии наук СССР, 1986
- Панасенко Л.А. Когнитивные основания интерпретирующего потенциала лексических категорий // Интерпретация мира в языке: коллективная монография коллективная монография / Л.В. Бабина [и др.]; науч. ред. Н.Н. Болдырев. – Тамбов: Издательский дом ТГУ им. Г.Р. Державина, 2017
12. Радченко О.А. История лингвофилософской мысли. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2005.С.32
13. Collins Cobuild Learner's Dictionary. – London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1996
14. Cambridge International Dictionary of English. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
15. Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. – Harlow: Longman Group UK Ltd., 1992
16. Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang. – Oxford University Press, 1996.