

THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION OF
THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

THE UZBEK STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY

English philology faculty

Course paper

The theme: Comparative typological studies
in Europe in the XVII-XX centuries

Student: Rashidov Sandjor

Group: 413^A

Teacher: _____

Tashkent - 2014

THEME:" COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES IN EUROPE IN THE XVII - XX CENTURIES"

PLAN:

- 1.Early comparative typological studies in Russia
- 2.Comparative typological studies in Germany and elsewhere.
- 3.Modern comparative typological studies.
4. Notion of supersegmental means of language
- 5.Stress, its definition, types and functions in Modern English, Uzbek and Russian
- 6.Intonation, its definition, types and functions in Me Mu and MR
- 7.Conclusion.

Linguistic Typology or typology of languages is a unit of general linguistic. It has its subject. Its methods, patterns and history, which defines its independence among other patterns of linguistic.

In modern scientific literature on linguistic the subject of linguistic typology is made out differently. There are various deliberations in defining the subject of typology: some linguists ostensibly wide the circle and volume of science of typology, another, on contrary, they understand the typology very narrow field of researches.

The important thing in this case the specific point of view of J.Ellis is deserved, in his work, which is devoted to common questions of comparison study system of different genetic relative and irrelative languages, the methodology of comparison and interactions of different philology disciplines, which also has the definitely regard to full or part comparison, strongly broads the sphere of using typology. He includes

into the sphere of comparison linguistic the theory of translation, dialectology and etc, which are in a close attitude with linguistic typology; they are in the core of researches and other special scientific fields.

In spite of detailed classification of comparative linguistic, the aim, character and types of comparative exploration in works of J. Ellis are not differentiated concretely with each other.

In typology discoveries we meet different terms, which are belongs to definite units of typology. We can refer such definition as “typology”, “structural typology”, “comparative typology”, “Arial linguistic”, “characterology” , contrastive linguistic confrontation linguistic, “linguistic universals”, “translating grammar”, “comparative linguistic typology” and the tier of others.

Anglistic is also not free from diversity of terms.

In English scientific literature the phrase “Comparative philology” is often used in spite of the definition “general linguistic”. Terms “comparison”, “confrontation” and “comparative method”, “confrontative method” is usually used synonymically.

With development of science about comparative study of languages, the linguists commence differentially pay regard to these terms. The comparative method is understood as comparative- historical exploration of relative languages, and confrontative - the comparison (confrontation) and relative and irrelative languages in synchronic size.

However the terms “confrontation”, “confrontative method” and many others are also not in one line between confrontative relative and irrelative languages. To the confrontative grammar, for instance, we

can refer the confrontation of grammar system and relative and irrelative languages.

For the last years the comparative linguistic and method of comparative study of systems of various languages more became attract the attention of scholars of the entire world, and for the last 10 years the series of fundamental researches which is devoted to different parts of typology of languages. As a result the linguistic science has definite data, which give a chance to define distinctly the subject of typology, its patterns and methods of analyze.

The works of R. Jakobson characterized and made a rich of subject typology. He wrote: "the genetic method deals with relation, Arial with correlation of languages and typological- with isomorphism. The difference between relation and correlation, isomorphism does not without fail connect with factor of time, and factor of space. Isomorphism can unit different positions of the same language, or two positions (as simultaneous and as separate in time) of two different languages, which closely are situated and in a long distance, as relative languages, which have another origin.

In researches of comparative linguistic the definite attempts are made to define the character of linguistic typology. However the solely value is not worked out to understand the maintains of subject typology. In this case following deliberations are told: a) linguistic typology is a self science discipline, which includes into its subject of researches all types of comparison of linguistic systems. In this understanding linguistic typology pointed out from comparison linguistic in the full volume of this world; b) linguistic typology is a part of comparison

linguistic. It figures independently and confronts against traditional comparability, character logic and Areal linguistic. In this term linguistic typology compares with structural typology. The principle significance has quantities limit of compared languages. There is no concrete opinion about this question. Some scholars support the side of comparison unlimited numbers of languages. In their confirmations they come from statements of linguistic universals, and in their opinion the results of researches must be universality. Another linguists write about possibility of comparison unlimited numbers of relative languages.

And, at last the third group of linguists confirms that we can minimize the number of compared languages- to two languages in linguistic typology. The reason of all these opinions serves undifferentiated approach to the patterns or types of linguistic typology. There are not yet enough files in linguistic science for explanation such important task of linguistic typology, as for example, the definition of subject of each patterns and type of linguistic typology.

Sometimes such facts exist, as confrontation against comparison and typological ways, though the first must be discussed as composition. In some works of comparison study of languages the comparison is divided into typological research of relative and irrelative languages, confront the structural and typological description of languages, and also the characteristically and uncharacteristically research is confronted and etc.

The more detailed characteristic of typology is given in works of B.A. Uspenskiy, Yu.V. Rojdestvenskiy, V.G. Gaka. The worth thing in

the work of Yu. V. Rojdestvenskiy is that it also compares the subject of typology and charactology. The basis of subject of typology contains the structural typology, which consolidate the series of units of this field: 1) typological classification of languages; 2) linguistic universals; 3) the language- the sample; 4) special typology theory and etc.

In the type of subject of research the typology is divided into the typology of text, typology of system and etc. This concept of patterns of typology is more systemized. Special attention in this case of one fact is deserved, that Yu.V.Rojdestvenskiy compares typology and structural typology and the difference from some linguists; he does not regret the existence of other units of typology, which also study the comparison of system of different relative and irrelative languages.

Among a lot of diversities of existence definitions the typology is understood as a different type of comparison of systems of languages. Genetic, typological and arial comparison contains three sides of one process of comparison. These methods don't complete with each other.

Thus, types of linguistic comparison we can imagine the following way: 1) comparative-genealogical (historical) comparison (reconstruction of general forms of relative languages); 2) typological comparison of systems and subsystems of languages. Special attention, one share is deserved onto close relative and far relative languages the structural differences can become so significant, the "relativeness" there can be preserved in a type of historical factor. 3) Arial linguistic, which is characterized the comparison of systems of languages of definite geographical closeness. The forth type can be included into the

dominant classification of G.P. Melnicov, which defines linguistic types on the basis of dominant features.

Here we will not specially point on the concepts of character and nature of each from pointed methods. But we consider to that linguistic typology, which studies with synthesized given results of descriptive works, the linguistic typology must include all fields of linguistic comparison.

As we see the Comparative typological studies go back to the XI centry. Since that time it has been developing on and on till nowadays. If we have a glance at Europe the comparative approaches to languages in contact started much earlier than those in Central Asia.

The comparative typological studies in Europe are closely linked with the names of such Russian scholars as I.Dombrovsky, A.H.Vostokov. German scholars as J.Brimm, F.Bopp, V.Humbold, brothers F.Schelegel and A.Shelegel, H.Steintal.

F.Mystely. Dutch scholars as R.C.Rask and many others. Today comparative typological studies are closely linked with the names of such well-known scholars as I. I. Meshaninov. J. Gresnberg, Josgub, V. D. Arakin, L. V. Sherba. A. V. Vinogradov. B. A. Uspenskiy, Y. V. Rozhdestvensky, G. H. Kilimov, G. P. Melnikov, S. D. Katznelson, V. N. Yartseva, J. Boranov. U. K. Yusupov, A. A. Abduazizov and many others. Let's consider some of the investigations by the above mentioned scholars In the XVII centry a Russian scholar I.Dombrovsky made some works of great importance for comparative linguistics:

1 Origin of Slovonc languages.

2. Slavonic languages (Fundamentals of Old Slavonic Language) In these works I.Dombrovsky, for the first time in the Russian linguistics, gave the comparative characteristics of the Slavonic languages, their origin paying prime attention to it. So we can call him the founder of the comparative method in Russian linguistics.

Another prolific Russian scholar A.H.Vostokov (1781-1864) carried out some serious comparative analysis of the Slavonic languages. He is the author of a very serious comparative research work "Comparative study of Russian, Polish and Old Slavonic. Here is another brilliant work on the comparative linguistics by A.H.Vostokov 'Description of the Russian and Slavonic Manuscripts' the latter is kept at the Rumyantsev Museum. A well - known Dutch scholar Rasmus Christian

Rask carried out some interesting scientific research work on Islandic languages, which resulted in the creation of the following works.1) Investigations of the Origin of the Old Islandic Language (Written in 1918)

2) On the Frakian Group of Languages (Islandic and other Languages)(written in 1822)

A German scholar F.Bopp (1791-1867)-one of the founders of the Comparative typology of Indoeuropean languages investigated Sanscrit in comparison with the Greek, Latin Persian and Germanic languages which resulted in creating a fundamental work "System of Conjugation in Sanscrit compared with the Greek, Latin, Persian and Germanic Languages".

Later he worked on another valuable research which gave birth to his famous work on comparative linguistics "Grammar of Sanscrit,

Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic and German", (written in 1833-1849). A German scholar Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1892) was the first to give a systematic comparative study of different languages in his work "On the language and Wisdom of the Indians" (written in 1808). In this work Schlegel for the first time paid attention to the dissimilarities of the structure of the languages compared. He distinguishes two language types : 1) languages with affixes (Turkic languages Polynesian languages and even Chinese

2) flexive languages (Semitic language, Georgian, French languages). His brother August Schlegel (1767-1845) further developed this classification of languages by dividing the languages into three types:

- 1) languages without a grammatical structure
- 2) affixational languages
- 3) flexive languages

August Schlegel concluded that the Chinese and the languages of Indochina had to be classified into a special group of languages, because there was no flexion in them, the grammatical relations being expressed by the help of word order.

A. Schlegel spoke of the following language types: 1) synthetic - early languages 2) analytical - languages of late

The comparative study of languages in full and complete form is observed in the works of a German scholar Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), whose works mark a new phase of the development of the former.

V. Humboldt is the author of some works on comparative typological research:

1. On, the Differences of Structure of Human Languages and his Impact on the Spiritual Development of Man (written in 1836-1839).
2. On the Languages of kavi in the Island Yava (written in 1836-1839) Humboldt knew many languages, including the languages of American Indians and Polynesian languages.

It is Humboldt who for the first time gave a more or less complete typological classification of languages.

He distinguished four types of languages:

1) Isolating languages like Chinese (or amorph languages with no change of the word form) agglutinative languages like Turkic ones the monosemantic morphemes used in the word.

2)Flective languages like Indoeuropean ones or semit ones with polysemantic morphemes used in the word.

3)Incorporative languages with word-sentences (all words in a sentence written together) like the Chucot language, etc.

For Humboldt language was an emanation (expression) of the spirit of human beings, language was, in his understanding, a psychology of the people speaking it.

And it was Humboldt's mistake that he thought that the typology of languages reflect different cultural level of development of the people In his understanding, the flective languages have strictly correct form of expression, that is why he declared them to be the top of language research, other languages being at the lower pages of development. Francis Bopp (1791-1867) another German, linguist one of those scholars who introduced the method of comparative study of

languages, divided the languages into two types as to the syllabic structure of words:

- 1) monosyllabic (with roots of one syllable)
- 2) polysyllabic (with roots of many syllables) semitic languages.

The successor and disciple of V. Humboldt H. Steintal (1823-1899) made a good step forward in the elaboration of the typological theory. He worked out syntactical criteria for the classification of languages.

F. Mystel, who continued the work of H. Steintal gave an original classification of languages as to:

- 1) the order of words in a sentence (analytical language structure)
- 2) the inner structure words

August Schlegel (1821-1868) made an attempt to make Humboldt's classification more clear. He called Humboldt's classification morphological. He thought that the types of languages established by the Schlegel brothers were not only the three main types of languages, but also the three stages of language development (it was based on his biological conception of language development).

An American linguist Edward Sapir (1887-1939) gave a strong criticism of the morphological classification of the Languages calling it evolutionistic, because it presupposes evolution of the structure of the isolating Languages into flexive, in which only the technique of word structure was taken into consideration only.

He offered his own classification of languages based on the three criteria:

- 1) the technique of morpheme building
- 2) the degree of synthesis of meanings of a morpheme in a word

3) character of grammatical processes

E. Sapir classifies languages into;

- 1) simple pure-relational languages without affixes (Chinese)
- 2) complicated pure-relational languages with affixes (the Turkic languages and the Polynesian languages)
- 3) simple-mixed-relational languages expressing the syntactical relations in a pure form with the help of agglutination or fusion, (French and others)
- 4) complicated mixed-relational languages, in which the meaning of morpheme may be changed by the help of affixes or inner sound alternation
(Latin and English)

In the history of typological studies I.I. Meshaminov's classification is original. His is a syntactical one based on syntactical criteria;

1) languages of the passive structure (the Chukot language and languages of American Indians). There are no transitive and intransitive verbs in these languages.

2) languages of the ergative structure (Avar, Lezgi, Dargin, Georgian slightly). In each language the verb not only agrees with the subject, but also governs it. The predicate verb demands that the subject be in a special case-ergative case, if the verb is transitive, if it is not transitive. the subject should be in the absolute nominative case.

3) nominative languages, in which subject is always in the nominative case

irrespective of the transitive and intransitive character of the verb.

The above mentioned classifications, as is seen from the above described, carry either a morphological or a syntactical character, and may be called phraseological.

There are some classifications of the languages on the basis of certain kinship between languages compared which are known as "geneological" classifications according to which language families and relative languages are distinguished and studied.

Following Meschaninov's typology his successors have worked out different theories on the comparative typological studies of languages.

For example G.P.Melinicov worked out his theory of determination as a leading grammatical tendency in a language, which explains the changes in the grammatical structure of this or that language. It is known that long before that O.Jespersen worked out his theory of notional categories of languages, based on logical criteria. His notional categories are of great importance in comparative typological research, because they imply that some grammatical categories in given language may be expressed by lexical means and not grammatical ones or vice versa.

Comparative study of languages by the help the notion of

"Lexicogrammatical field" by G.Shoor (Guliga, Shendels) it is based on the principle "from meaning to means of expression" and it is also a method of comparative analysis. Further there was offered a theory of "Functional semantic fields" the A.V.Bondarko.

Typological studies were further continued in the theory by prof.

J.B.Buranov who offered a method of analysis by the help of "typological categories" of the type:

- 1) Typological category of diminitiveness
- 2) Typological category of causativeness
- 3) Typological category of plurality
- 4) Typological category of possessivity
- 5) Typological category of comparativeness
- 6) Typological category of locativity
- 7) Typological category of reflexivity
- 8) Typological category of reciprocity
- 9) Typological category of activeness/passiveness
- 10) Typological category of translativity/intransitivity
- 11) Typological category of futurity
- 12) Typological category of presency
- 13) Typological category of priority
- 14) Typological category of posteriority
- 15) Typological category of aspectuality

A detailed model of comparative typological research was offered by prof U.K.Yusupov, who made a whole system approach to the languages compared

(See: his Проблемы сопоставительной лингвистики Т., 1980). In his fundamental research work prof. U. K.Yusupov made an attempt at working out and offering some very relevant features-typological constants as to the levels of languages hierarchy, beginning with the phonetico-phonological level and ending in the textological level.

Prof. U. K.Yusupov offers the following methods of comparative typological analysis as to the language hierarchy:

1. Methods of comparing languages in their abstract systems.

2.Methods of comparing grammatical system of non-related languages
3.Methods of comparing lexical systems of non-related languages
4.Methods of comparing word-building systems of non-related languages.

5. Methods of comparing phraseological systems of non - related languages.

6. Methods of comparing languages in speech systems

7. Methods of comparing languages in textual systems

The above mentioned models of comparative typological analysis offered above by different scholars lay a solid ground for further investigations and elaborate and enrich the comparative typological theory with new linguistic data and pave way to new horizons in this sphere of scientific research activities.

When we learn languages in comparison we are to compare along with the other means of the languages their supersegmental means such as stress and intonation. So what is a stress ? What kind of notion is it ? How do we find it ?

Let's answer these questions so as to reveal phonological nature of "stress" as a supersegmental means of the compared languages. By stress or accent we understand a type of a phonological process, that is distinguishing of one of the syllables in word structure or word combination by different phonological means.

Such a definition works equally well in the 3 languages compared.Further we have to compare the types of the stress? So what is a type of a stress ? By a stress type we understand a stable unity of structural acoustic features, characterizing the

given stress as a suprasegmental phonological means.

1) as to its nature stress may be :

a) dynamic (if defined by the force of uttering) b) musical (if linked with the height of tone)

c) quantitative (if attended by the length of the sound)

2) as to the place (position of a stress there may be such types as):

a) fixed

b) non-fixed

3) as to the quality of a stress there may be such types as:

a) main stress

b) secondary stress

4) as to the function the stress may be of the following types:

a) distinctive (it makes one word distinct from the other)

b) form distinguishing function (roaa, singular), (roaa, plural) Sure, in the above types of the stress in the compare languages we see the dissimilarities.

For example: in ME, MR and MU there are more dissimilarities than similarities in the types, places functions and qualities of the stress.

English and Russian have a more or less fixed stress whereas in Uzbek stress is free and always at the end of the word.

бола+лар+нинг

original

originally

originality (a bit moved)

But Russian is flexible

Слово-словарь, словари

Заметить-замечать

Кончать-заканчивать

In the languages compared stress has certain similarities of the following kind:

1. Stress may be moving clockwise:

In English : responsible - responsibility

In Uzbek: ука-укалар-укаларнинг

In Russian : кончик-конец

2. In English and Russian stress may be moving anticlockwise:infamous-famous

desert (noun) - desert (verb)

record (noun) - record (verb)

вычитать-читать

выйти-выходить

Typologically we can speak of different types of languages as to the position (place) of the stress in the word structure. It lays a solid foundation even for a serious classification of world languages into the following types:

1.Languages with a fixed stress

2.Languages with a moving stress:

a) clockwise

b) anticlockwise

c) both clockwise and anticlockwise

Hence, we can speak of types of languages with a fixed stress:

1)at the beginning of the word

2)in the midst of the word

3)at the and of the word

On the basis of the aforesaid, we can classify languages into two major types as to the position of the stress in the word:

1)oxytonic (with a stress always at the and of the word)

2)non-oxytonic, that is with a stress either at the beginning or in the midst of the word or both. So, from this point of view English and Russian are more less alike, because they are non-oxytonic, where as Uzbek a pure oxytonic language. The allomorphic features here are accounted for by the different typological features of the languages in comparison. Uzbek being a representative of an agglutinative language with highly developed phenomenon of inhormony, English representing an analytical language type and Russian belonging to a flecive type with some elements of analytism. This way the postulate on the politypological nature of any language type proves right, because though English and Russian which belong to the Indoeuropean family of languages are typologically referred to as analyticaland flecive, one can also witness their certain features of agglutination and like Uzbek may, surely, demonstrate its flecive and analytical features, though remaining an aggluntinative typology as in future there may be some fundamental research in this field of analysis which may throw further light on the typological features of stress as a segmental means of any language. Typological features of intonation.

Intonation is one of the supersegmental means of the languages in comparison. By intonation we understand a type of a supersegmental means of language of acomparisated structure, insluding melody for pitch different types of stress pauses, and tembre variants.

Hypothetically intonation may be divided into the following types as to their function:

- 1) falling
- 2) rising
- 3) falling-rising
- 4) rising-falling
- 5) rising-falling-rising
- 6) falling-rising-falling

Studying intonation and stress as supersegmental means language brought forth the birth of a science called "prosodies". It is being elaborated today by phoneticians and phonologists.

Intonation types given above are structural phonological or typological ones and they may be well illustrated by melody pitch types.

There may be distinguished the following functional type of intonation as well;

- 1) declarative intonation
- 2) interrogative intonation
- 3) exclamatory intonation
- 4) imperative intonation

As we see these types are communicative-functional type of intonation and are distinguished as to the purpose of intonation usage. All three languages compared naturally have all the above mentioned (both structural or typological and communicative) types of intonation.

They all speak for certain isomorphic features of the languages under study and can be accounted for by the certain functional features of the intonation as a supersegmental means in languages.

Here the pragmatics of intonation is to be taken into consideration, which may help us to reveal certain allomorphic features of the intonation used by different informants with sure, different culture and thinking and knowledge of languages usage.

The pragmatics of intonation can be well illustrated question (sentence) types (general, special disjunctive, alternative and rhetorical) and one can reveal universal pragmatic features of intonation in the latter are characterized by the following common features given in the matrixes I, II, II, IV, V below;

Matrix I

FEATURES

INTONATION TYPES IN GENERAL QUESTIONS

№

LANGUA

GE Rising Falling Rising-

falling

Falling-

rising

Falling-

rising-

falling

Rising

falling

rising

1. English + - - - - -

2. Uzbek + - - - - -

3. Russian + - - - - -

Matrix II

FEATURES

INTONATION TYPES IN SPECIAL QUESTIONS

№

LANGUA

GE falling Rising Falling-

rising

Rising-

falling

Rising

falling

rising

Fal-ling-

risingfal-

ling

1. English + - - - - -2. Uzbek + - - - - -

3. Russian + - - - - -

Matrix III

FEATURES

INTONATION TYPES IN DISJUNCTIVE QUESTIONS

№

LANG

UAGE Risi

ng

Fallin

g

Risin

g-

fallin

g

Fallin

g-

rising

Falling

-rising-

falling

Ri-sing fal-ling rising

1. English - - - + - -

2. Uzbek - - - + - -

3. Russia

n

- - - + - -

Matrix IV

FEATURES

INTONATION TYPES IN ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS

№

LANG

UAGE Risi

ng

Falli

ng

Risin

g-

fallin

g

Fal

lin

g-

risi

ng

Falling-

rising-

falling

Ri-sing fal-ling rising

1. Englis

h

--+---

2. Uzbek --+---

3. Russia

n

--+-- -In the languages compared one can see transposition functions of one and

the same sentence type uttered differently in different situations with different

communicative purpose and intention and it largely depends on the speaker what

intonation and what communicative intention he is going to realize.