

*Яхшиева З.Ш., преподаватель кафедры
«Иностранная филология», Джизакский государственный
педагогический институт им. А. Кадирий.*

*Бабаджанова Г.Б., преподаватель кафедры
«Иностранная филология», Джизакский государственный
педагогический институт им. А. Кадирий.*

*Жумартова У.У., студент 3 курса,
Джизакский государственный педагогический институт
им. А. Кадирий. Узбекистан, г. Джизак.*

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗНООБРАЗИЕ

Аннотация: Опыт функционирования языков в многонациональных государствах доказывает, что двуязычие и многоязычие являются необходимым и практически единственным способом решения проблемы преодоления языковых барьеров и обеспечения свободного общения между гражданами одного государственного образования, говорящими на разных языках.

Ключевые слова: общение, многоязычие, монолингвизм, двуязычие.

LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

Abstract. The experience of the functioning of languages in multinational states proves that bilingualism and multilingualism is a necessary and practically the only way to solve the problem of overcoming language barriers and ensuring free communication between citizens of one state education, speaking different languages.

Keywords: communication, multilingualism, monolingualism, bilingualism.

If the process of communication were confined to the framework of language collectives, then in relation to cultures, humanity would be no less variegated and diverse picture than in terms of language. But the situation is

different. The regions of the most pronounced linguistic diversity, such as the Caucasus, New Guinea, the province of the Plateau in Nigeria, the Oaxaca region in Mexico, etc., are not at all distinguished by the corresponding ethnic diversity. Cases of striking uniformity in the field of culture in the presence of a variegated variety of languages serve as proof that communication can overcome and indeed overcomes language boundaries. It is possible due to the medium of multilingual carriers.

This inference finds empirical confirmation in the extremely rich data of Indian language statistics. The linguistic diversity in India is unevenly distributed: it is very pronounced in a number of areas of Assam, in the center of the Deccan peninsula, around the Rajasthan desert and along the Tibetan passes, while the main parts of the northern plain and almost all the coast from a linguistic point of view are completely homogeneous. Possession of a language other than native is also very uneven. One would expect, at least, that both these indicators are directly dependent on each other, but in reality they are independent. This means that in a number of areas the linguistic diversity is more or less fully compensated for by bilingualism (in cities, on the De Peninsula, along the aisles to Tibet), which cannot be said, for example, about Assam, Rajasthan and in general about rural areas if compared to urban . This gap is greatest in the regions for which the greatest degree of cultural backwardness is characteristic. Thus, the obstacle to the process of communication is not just linguistic diversity per se, but linguistic diversity combined with a lack of multilingualism that compensates for it.

Although multilingualism, undoubtedly, is a phenomenon not only significant, but also quite common and widespread, it is accepted, including among linguists, to consider monolingualism as a rule, and multilingualism as something exceptional. This highly idealized view has a number of sources. One of them is the temptation to extrapolate the experience of several European and American countries, which for a short historical period were approaching, with a certain success, to the consciously set goal - the full standardization of language as a

symbol and instrument of their national existence. Another source of this view is related to the fact that structural linguistics in the early stages of its development required the assumption of synchronism and the qualitative homogeneity of the linguistic texts that served as the object of its description. But neither the cultural-geographical partitions nor the temporary methodological guidelines connected with the infantile immaturity of our science should not obscure from us the fact that millions of people, perhaps the majority of people, in one's or another degree master two or more linguistic systems and are able to use them individually, depending on the requirements of the situation.

One might argue that talking about multilingualism without touching on the question of the minimum difference between languages means giving this problem an overly broad and indefinite interpretation. But a point of view is quite justified, in which cases of possession, say, French and Vietnamese, French and Provençal, or even Parisian and Marseillan, French are considered as variations in essence of the same phenomenon. Because the problem facing the speaker in all these cases is qualitatively the same: to follow a huge number of norms in the appropriate contexts; and in case of failure, the result is the same: the intrusion (interference) of the norms of one system within another. And it is not at all obvious that clearly different systems of norms are easier to confuse than similar systems.

Another feature of multilingualism, which is easy to imagine in the form of a variable, is the degree of proficiency in each given language for the same speaker. Completely free and comprehensive knowledge of the two languages, of course, is very different from the assimilation of only the beginnings of the second language; but again the difficulty of the task facing the person and the nature of his failures when duplicating the monolingual norms of each of the languages (in contrast to the "sizes" of these failures) are similar in both cases. The comparative degree of mastery of the two languages can not at all be precisely formulated in purely linguistic terms. This is one of the many aspects of bilingualism (which we will further discuss for simplicity and consider as the most important type of

multilingualism), for the study of which linguistics needs cooperation with psychology and social sciences.

From a linguistic point of view, the problem of bilingualism is to describe the several linguistic systems that are in contact with each other; to identify those differences between these systems that make it difficult to simultaneously own them and to predict in this way the most probable manifestations of interference that arises from the contact of languages and, finally, to indicate in the behavior of bilingual speakers those deviations from the norms of each of the languages that are associated with their bilingualism. But not all the potential possibilities of interference go into reality. Different people with different success overcome the tendency to interference - both automatically and consciously.

In any linguistic study, it is important to distinguish between the production of the speaker-that is, some finite text, however long it is-and the system behind it that exists in his brain and allows him to produce not only this text but also an infinite number of other utterances , which will be perceived by the rest of the members of his language team as corresponding to the language norm. No less relevant is this difference and for the study of the phenomena of language contact. But the speaker can always (and many people in this respect are especially gifted) learn how to reproduce with absolute certainty a number of models of a foreign language, by no means mastering this language as a whole generating system, that is, not acquiring the ability to produce an infinite number of correct combinations of elements of this language. It may also happen that some statements generated by a system of one language will accidentally prove to be in accordance with the rules and norms of another language.

So, for example, some final Russian -s may turn out to be the right expression for the French phoneme / s /, even though its deafness is not a distinguishing feature in Russian, and its hardness contrasts it with another Russian phoneme / s' /, which is completely alien to the system of oppositions of the French language. Similarly, the order of the words subject - complement - predicate in fr.

il me voit, being applied to the corresponding Russian words, will give the right sentence from the point of view of substance and an equivalent sentence: he sees me; However, this order of words in the Russian utterance contains an additional formal element that opposes this statement to another, for example, he sees me, who does not have a simple equivalent in French.

Therefore, in the study of bilingualism, it is unreasonable to limit one's attention to interference phenomena observed on the material of limited texts, since even statements that are correct from the point of view of the substance in C can be the result of chance, behind which there are significant gaps in the possession of the C language as the generating system. The analysis of bilingualism should continue until the degree of proficiency of each of the linguistic systems is fully determined.

A special problem arises in connection with the difference between passive and active language proficiency. There are good reasons to believe that the ability to decode messages is primary and in part even independent of the ability to code them. From the point of view of the psychology of the language, a description of the process in which a person begins to understand an unfamiliar language, while doing so without any clear instructions from the outside, is of serious interest. From the point of view of the sociology of bilingualism, it is even more important to explore those bilateral relations that arise between two speakers or even between two language collectives, when everyone speaks (encodes) in their own language and freely decodes messages sent by the partner. Such relations are especially characteristic for those cases when it is a question of dialects of one language or closely related languages of the Scandinavian type. In such cases, this particular psycholinguistic attitude of the speakers turns into a sense of the regularity of the differences between systems and the recognition of these differences as clear formulas for the transition - even by people arbitrarily far from comparative linguistics. The study of "diasystems" (synchronic description of dialect systems)

has attracted the attention of many linguists recently, and, of course, the works on the psychological nature of disasters in native speakers follow.

In addition to the specific manifestations of the impact of one language on another, the question of whether contact can affect the general grammatical stock of a language is also of legitimate interest. So far, unfortunately, there is not enough convincing data on this issue. Of course, it would be tempting to look at the tendency of numerous Indo-European languages to be analytic as a single historical process, in which some non-Indo-European languages also participated; However, we do not have sufficient control material necessary for such conclusions. But, perhaps, it is possible to assert with a great degree of confidence that the rapidly evolving bilingualism as such, regardless of the store of languages involved, leads to an increase in analyticity in the event that conditions contribute to the maintenance of interference. It can be shown that, for example, Creole languages are often more analytical than their "ancestors".

The dictionary of any language is constantly in a fluid state, some words are out of use, others, on the contrary, are put into circulation. Words with a low frequency may simply just not be firmly held in memory to function steadily. Regular phonological and grammatical changes can lead to the emergence of inconvenient or burdensome homonymous pairs, one of whose members must be replaced by some other word. In some semantic spheres there is a common need for synonyms, especially when it comes to expressive vocabulary, designed to replace words that have lost their expressiveness.

In societies with a high level of social mobility, where social dialects have disappeared as such, a special aristocratic vocabulary can serve as a password for the public elite, but it is doomed to permanent variability due to imitation by the hungry mass exaltation. Part of this demand for updating the dictionary can be satisfied with neologisms of internal origin. But especially rich and fresh material can be obtained from foreign languages. Because of the ease of spreading lexical units (in comparison with phonological and grammatical rules), a minimal contact

between languages is sufficient for borrowing words. With massive bilingualism, the lexical influence of one language on another can reach enormous proportions. Under certain socio-cultural conditions, bilingual speakers have something like a fusion of the vocabulary of two languages into a single lexical innovation fund. Lexical borrowings can be investigated from the point of view of the interference mechanism that leads to them, and from the point of view of phonological, grammatical, semantic and stylistic growth of new words into the borrowing language. Let us first consider the question of the mechanism of interference.

It is important for a linguist to remember that the direction and speed of a linguistic shift is not necessarily related to the direction and power of linguistic influence. The carriers of the "dying" language can convey the phonetic and grammatical features of their speech as a substratum to future generations of native speakers of the "winner" language. But it happens - for example, in many Indian Native American tribes - that the language dies entirely and in untouched form. The need for a separate description of the "internal" and "external" destinies of the language is another argument in favor of combining the efforts of linguistics and other sciences in the study of multilingualism.

References

1. Dalby D. Linguasphere register of the world's languages and speech communities (Introduction and index). Hebron (Wales). 2000. Vol. 1.
2. Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982).
3. Wurm S.A. (ed.) Atlas of the world's languages in danger of disappearing. Canberra. P.: Pacific Linguistics / UNESCO, 2002. 2nd ed.
4. Hohenthal A. English in India. Loyalty and Attitude // Language in India. Strength for Today and Bright Hope For Tomorrow. 2003