

On Some Features of Language Development

Kuldasheva Shakhnoza Akramovna

Senior Lecturer

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Tashkent, Uzbekistan



Abstract— The article deals with the investigation of the problem of some problematic aspects of language development. This problem has become topical in the 21st century, when the population of the majority of newly established in the XX and XXI century countries began discussing the problems related to their history, that had never been touched by the state authorities belonging to other ethnic identities. This kind of wide-spread interest to the ethnic History of their countries can give two types of results: the first result is a true-to-life, well-analyzed, theoretically based and well-grounded History of a nation; the second result will be a fictive combination of history and mystification and fairy tale-like stories, half-religious, half-thought out texts instead of a good History of an ethnic group or a country. It is clear to expect the flourishing of the second type of History compiling, as the lack of Academic Institutions and the specialists dealing with History will say its negative word.

Keywords—*language development, ethnic identities, mystification, lexical structure, grammatical structure, language change*

I. INTRODUCTION

Among other instances of social phenomena, language has a number of features that distinguish it from them. These features of language include its structural aspect, the presence of certain physical aspects that allow the study of language by physical means, the addition of defining elements, forms that interact with human mental activity and the real world. The whole set of features that characterize a language is unique among other social situations, only the language-specific feature determines the forms and patterns of its development. However, human language has many facets. The difference in the structure of languages is that the ways and forms of development of each language lead to the expression of individual characteristics separately.

Accordingly, the laws of language relate to language as a general social condition of a particular order, or to a particular and specific language, where it is permissible to speak of general or individual laws of language.

General laws provide a systematic similarity of language development processes, which is determined by the specific general nature of language, its essence, its social function and the qualitative characteristics of its structural components as a social status of a particular order for all languages. In relation to other social situations, they participate as linguistic peculiarities, and it is this circumstance that gives rise to them as the internal laws of language; but within the language they remain general. Language development cannot be imagined without the participation of these laws. Although these legal formulas are the same for all languages, they may be the same in different specific contexts. In their exact form, they have different expressions depending on the structural features. However, despite the fact that the general laws of language development are different, they remain the general law for all languages, because they are determined not by the structural features of specific languages, but by the specific nature of human language as a separate social phenomenon.

Although in the history of linguistics the problem of defining the general laws of language did not have a definite goal-oriented definition, it has almost always been the focus of linguists in connection with the problems of nature and the essence of language. For example, F. Bopp's attempt to reveal the laws of physics and mechanics in language development, A. Schleicher's attempt to subordinate language development to Darwin's theory of evolution, F. de Saussure's introduction of language into "the science of world of semiotic signs in society" (semiology), the N. Chomsky's method of interpretation of language by the method of mathematical logic - all these are essentially all-round studies aimed at defining the general laws of language.

II. METHODS OF RESEARCH

Typically, these studies were carried out in a comparative way or, in other words, using the criteria of other sciences - physics (in F. Bopp), natural science (in A. Schleicher), sociology (in F. de Saussure), mathematical logic (in Chomsky). Moreover, it is not important to define the general laws of language without comparing them with the observation of their own (different) interpretation in the structure and development of particular languages. The general laws of language, for example, include the constant existence of two orders - the order of "expression" and the order of "content", including the three-part formula of the basic elements of language structure: phoneme - word - sentence, the development of language as a form of existence. These general laws also include the law of inequality in the rate of development of various structural elements of language, which allows us to observe their unique understanding in particular languages.

According to this law, the lexical structure of a language and its grammatical structure have different degrees of stability, if, for example, the vocabulary reflects all the changes in society quickly and directly, and at the same time is an increasingly active part of the language, then the grammatical structure is very slow changes and therefore it is a very stable part of the language. However, when we look at how this general law is implemented in specific languages, it immediately becomes clear that certain aspects apply, that is, not only to the forms that implement this law, but also to the pace of development itself. For example, if we compare the grammatical structure of German and English (close to related Germanic languages), their development at a stage close to ours in antiquity shows the following view even in the modern case. These two languages bear a striking resemblance to their grammatical structure in the ancient periods of their development, which can be described as synthetic in common lines. Modern English differs significantly from modern German in its grammatical structure: it is a language with an analytical structure, while German continues to remain a significantly synthetic language. This situation also represents the other side of the phenomenon under consideration. The grammatical structure of the German language, in contrast to the grammatical structure of the English language, is close to the state confirmed in its ancient dialects. This, in turn, indicates that the grammatical structure of the English language has changed at a very rapid rate over a period of time, which is not the case in the grammatical structure of the German language.

Changes in the grammatical structure of English and German can also be seen through a simple comparison of the same variation paradigm in the core of the word at different stages of development of these languages. The similarity between Old English and modern German is evident both when deviating from the different forms of variation of nouns (weak-consonant, strong-vowel) and even when considering the different forms of variation associated with differences in gender (nouns), as well as modern English from these two languages. the distance of the tongue can also be seen. The English substantive now does not only distinguish between different types of forms (strong and weak) or irregular forms, but also does not have variable forms at all. In contrast, modern German not only retains ancient differences in the types of variation, but also has much in common with Old English in the forms of variation paradigms themselves.

Changes in two languages, however, have different forms, which are determined by certain laws of language development. However, before moving on to the expression of this second category of the law of language development, it is worth noting the following. The large and small speeds of development of different languages cannot be a basis for talking about the greatness and smallness of the development of languages in a comparative process. In particular, the fact that English has undergone a significant change in relation to Germanic languages within a single evolutionary period in grammatical relations does not justify the assumption that English is more advanced than German. It is illogical and inappropriate to think that languages are more or less developed during relatively limited periods of their development, and there is no criterion for applying a "final" opinion on their status in the modern stages of language science for comparative evaluation. Different languages develop in separate ways according to their own laws, and their developmental processes take different forms, so incomparable situations occur in such a case.

III. DISCUSSION

Based on the general laws of language development as a specific social phenomenon, it should be noted that any specific language development laws should be distinguished from those that are specific to this language and different from other languages. To this category of laws, it is possible to assume the name of some internal laws of development, because they are defined by the peculiarities in the structure of individual languages.

It is clear from the examples that the general and individual laws of development are not defined by an impenetrable wall boundary, but rather are merged with the general laws. This means that any specific language incorporates all aspects of language as a separate social state, and therefore can only develop on the basis of the general laws of language development. However, on the other hand, any specific language has a different structural structure, separate grammatical structure and phonetic system, different lexicon (dictionary), and in the language system this structure is distinguished by non-uniform legal combinations of components, sometimes the general development of individual languages. The appearance of the forms in which the laws are manifested will inevitably change. Certain forms of the development of definite languages, as we have said, are connected with certain laws of their development.

This situation can be observed by comparing the development of similar situations in different languages. As an example, you can stop at a category of tense. In the ancient periods of their development, English and German had almost the only uncomplicated system of tense: they existed only in the present tense and simple past tense forms. As for the future tense, it is expressed in a descriptive way or through contemporary forms. The further development of the two languages went through the improvement of their temporal system and the creation of a special form for the expression of the future tense. This process is reflected in the general laws of language development, according to which the grammatical structure of a language is slowly but surely restructured in a way that lags behind other aspects of the language in its rate of development. In this, the reconstruction took place gradually, which is consistent with another general law, namely the law of the gradual change of language quality through the accumulation of elements of a new type and the disappearance of elements of an old type. We have seen peculiarities in the implementation of the general laws recorded in the English and Germanic languages in their grammatical structure, including in the reconstruction of the temporal system. Although we have worked with closely related languages that have a significant amount of similar elements in its structure, it has occurred in different forms.

These different ways of development (in this case the future tense form) indicate that some different laws of language development have been applied in practice in German and English. The closeness of the original structure with regard to the fact that these languages are closely related led to the fact that although the development of the future tense form took place differently in English and German, it had some commonalities in its passage. What are the similarities and differences in the process of formation of the future tense form in these languages? This question is answered by the clear foundations of the history of these languages.

In general, future tense forms occur in a single structural diagram consisting of an auxiliary verb and an infinitive of the main (notional) verb, as well as often as auxiliaries through the use of those single modal verbs, their semantics changing in the process of becoming an auxiliary. Elsewhere, the development of the future tense form has differences that differ from the context in the application of different tense systems, depending on its current state. These differences are reflected in the following grounds.

In Old English, the future tense is usually represented by present tense forms. In addition, descriptive verbs are used with the modal verbs *shall* and *will*. This analytical form is also widespread in the Middle English period. The two verbs have slightly changed the appearance of their semantics in the process of becoming their own grammar, but at the same time, they have retained many of their old meanings to this day. In particular, because the two verbs were considered modal, they retained their modal meanings as well as the function of auxiliary verbs in the construction of future tense forms. Until the rule of their application was firmly established, the choice of this or that verb was determined by their explicit modal meaning: the verb *will* was used when the action arose from the individual desire of the subject, the verb *shall* shall be used when expressing more or less objective necessity or obligation. More *shall* be used in biblical style. *Will* is often used in dramatic dialogues, it is also often used in oral speech. The first norms for the use of the verbs *will* and *shall* in the auxiliary function were formulated by George Criter in 1622, which are based on clear modal meanings that connect the verb *shall* with the first person and the verb *will* with other persons. Grammarians have found that the use of the verb *shall* is highly appropriate by the first person to express the future tense because of the explicit modal semantics of this verb, which in its essence reflects a coercive dye or personal confidence, which in turn in many cases

inconsistent with the objective confirmation of the time. In this case, the verb *will* is very appropriate in its semantics. In the colloquial style of modern English, an abbreviated form of the auxiliary verb *will* and 'll' is produced, which replaces the use of the two verbs separately. In the Scottish, Irish, and American variants of English, the verb *will* is the generally accepted form of the auxiliary verb to form the future tense form.

Thus, English led to the formation of the future tense form, mainly through the understanding of modal meanings through the use of analytical constructions in the gradual elimination of their differentiation by individuals. This way of development is fully consistent with the desire to maximize the simplification of the English verb by expressing personal meanings.

In German, future tense forms developed in parallel on the basis of modal and type meanings; although the type-specific future tense ultimately prevailed, the modal future tense has not yet been completely removed from German. Figurative circulation through the verbs modal *sollen* and *wollen* was widely used in the period between the 11th and 14th centuries, and is also found in the early monuments of the ancient German period. Unlike English, the verb *sollen* is often used in all individuals. But then this construction began to take the place of another (descriptive future tense). In the Luther Bible it was less pronounced, and in modern German it had an important modal color.

The emergence of the figurative future must be traced back to the ancient period of the development of the German language. It can be seen that his bud is often used in the present tense of perfective verbs to express the future tense. However, according to its appearance as a grammatical category, it lives in German for some time, the present tense of the use of the present tense of the perfect tense as a future tense is broken, and it is used in Old German to determine conditions. From the 11th century onwards there is an analytical construction consisting of the verb *werden* and the formation of a modern adjective, which originally had a descriptive expression of the beginning, but by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries it began to be widely used to express the future tense. Later (from the twelfth century onwards) this construction took on a slightly different appearance (*werden*-infinitive, but not a modern adjective) and the modal excludes the future tense. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, it appears in all grammars as the only form of the future tense. German, unlike English, is used to create a future tense form specific to analytical construction, in which it retains the synthetic elements inherent in the entire grammatical structure of the German language. In particular, the verb *werden*, used in German as an auxiliary verb to form the future tense, retains its forms. Such are the exact ways of developing a grammatical situation that is closely related to related languages, but it takes different forms according to the specific laws of development in force in English and German.

Such differences also permeate the English and German lexicons, which are specific to different types of structures and to different images interacting with intelligible complexes. Palmer points out: "I think it is necessary to write these differences into the features of English and German as a tool for abstract thinking. German is superior to English in the simplicity and clarity of its signs, which can be seen in a simple example. When an English person wants to talk about his or her non-marriage, he or she must first use the new and complex word *celibacy*, which is completely different from the words *wed*, *marriage*, and *bachelor*. In contrast, the simplicity of the German language can be seen: *die Ehe* signifies a couple; from this word comes the quality of *ehe-los* - "unmarried." From this quality comes the term *Ehe-los-igkeit* - *celibacy* - by adding simple abstract suffixes to the noun, which is so understandable that it does not pose a problem even for street children. The abstract idea of the Englishman, on the other hand, stumbles upon the complexity of the word sign. Consider another example. If we talk about eternal life, we refer to the Latin word help in terms of the origin of the word "immortality", which is completely different from the ordinary *die* - "die" and *death* - "death". the German language again has an advantage because *Un-sterb-lich-keit* - the components of the word "infinity" can be clearly and constructively understood, as well as the basic *sterben* - understandable to all members of the language community who know the word "die".

Contrary to the grammatical structure based on the English and German lexicons noted by Palmer, there is also a theory that German lexicon is more analytical than English in terms of its structure.

IV. CONCLUSION

Thus, the special laws of development indicate in what ways the development of a particular language takes place. These methods are different in different languages, and the specific laws of development can only be seen in the example of a specific language. Thus, the laws of development of a particular language determine the national-specific history of this language, its qualitative independence.

The special laws of language development cover all its branches - phonetics, grammar, vocabulary. Each branch of language can have its own laws. For example, a reduced decline in the history of the Russian language can be included in the laws of development of the phonetics of this language. The construction of a framed construction can be defined as the law of development of German syntax. The unification of the basis in the history of the Russian language can be named by the law of development of its morphology. Such a law of the development of morphology of the Russian language is a developed reinforcement in the transitive and intransitive expression. The German language is characterized by the enrichment of the vocabulary of the language through the creation of new lexical units based on the mutual addition of words. This method of developing German dictionary content is not unique to other languages, such as modern French, and can be seen as one of the laws of word formation in German.

However, the laws of development of specific languages do not arise spontaneously from the laws of development of individual branches of language. Language is not a simple combination of linguistic - some quantity of phonetic, lexical and grammatical elements. It can be said, in which all its parts are interconnected in a system of legal relations, and therefore the structure of language is also discussed. This means that each element of the structural parts of a language is just like its structural parts, it balances its forms of development with the features of the whole structure of the language in general. Therefore, the phonetic system of a language, the existence of certain and distinct forms of development for its lexical structure and grammatical construction, the laws of development of its individual aspects interact with each other and reflect the features of the whole structure of language. An example of such an interaction is the process of reduction of suffixes in the history of English. These processes are associated with the emergence of a strong accent in Germanic languages and its consolidation in the core flour. The last elements, which had fallen into a weak state, were reduced and gradually completely lost. This situation is reflected both in word formation in English and in its morphology (extensive development of analytical constructions) and syntax (consolidation of a particular word order and its distribution by grammatical significance).

In Russian, on the other hand, it is permissible to include in that case a strong tendency to unstrengthened stress, because it is used as a means of semantic separation, i.e., it interacts with other aspects of the language (semantics).

Finally, it is possible to show the closeness that can be found in the private laws of development of different languages. Such languages may include related languages that have similar elements in their structure. The closer such languages are to each other, the more reason there is for them to have the same special laws of development.

It should also be noted that linguistic laws are not a driving force for language development. These forces are external factors in relation to language and have different characteristics, ranging from language carriers and their social needs to language relations and different manifestations of substrate situations. It is precisely this situation that means that language development cannot be considered in isolation from its historical context. However, accepting the external factor, linguistic laws give a certain direction or form to language development. In a number of cases and in certain areas of language (primarily lexicon and semantics), the specific nature of the external factors of language development can lead to correspondingly specific changes in the language system.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bopp F. (1816) On the Conjugation System of Sanskrit. Cited from: Hrestomatiya po istorii yazikoznaniya XIX-XX vekov. sost. Zvegintsev V.A. Moskva, 1956. 25-30 ss.
- [2] Buranov J.B. (1981) Sravnitel'naya tipologiya angliyskogo i tyurkskih yazikov. M.: V.Sh. – 248 s. (In Russian)
- [3] Chomskiy N. (1961) Tri modeli opisaniya yazika. // Kiberneticheskiy sbornik, vip. 2. - ss. 237-266.
- [4] Gamkrelidze T.V., & Ivanov Vyach. Vs. (1986) Indoyevropeyskiy yazik i indoyevropeytsi. Rekonstruktsiya i istoriko-tipologicheskiy analiz prayazika i protokul'turi. V 2h tomah. – Tbilisi: Izd. Tbilisskogo universiteta. – 1328 str. (In Russian)
- [5] Isabek B. (2015) Turkologiyaga kirish. Toshkent: Akademnashr. – 128 b. (In Uzbek)
- [6] Jirmunskiy V.M. (1964) Vvedeniye v sravnitel'no-istoricheskoye izucheniye germanskih yazikov. M.: Nauka. – 316 str. (In Russian)
- [7] Kuldashv A.M. (2019) On some problems and principles of language change. // Nauka i obrazovaniye segodnya. 6-2 (41). Moscow. - ss. 32-33. (In English)

- [8] Kuldasheva Sh. A. (2016) Ingliz tili taraqqiyotining asosiy tendentsiyalari va ularni belgilovchi omillar. // O'zMU Xabarlari. №1/3. T. - 275-277 bb. (In Uzbek)
- [9] Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar. // M.: Izd. "Sovetskaya entsiklopediya", 1990. Pod. red. V.N. Yartsevov, 2-izd. – M.: RYa, 2002. – 650 str.
- [10] Schleicher A. (1965) Znachenije yazika dlya yestestvennoy istorii cheloveka. // Berezin F.M. Istoriya lingvisticheskikh ucheniy. M.: Vissh. Shk., 1975. - 304 s.
- [11] Soussyure F. (2000) Zametki po obshey lingvistike. M. - 280 str.