

## THE OBJECT OF COMPARATIVE LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS IN CONTEMPORARY LINGUISTICS

Ziyoda kurbanova saydillaevna

Independent researcher, uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

The article reviews the development of comparative linguistics from its origins in the 16th century to modern approaches. Early studies compared classical and vernacular languages through vocabulary and grammar, eventually leading to universal grammar as a framework for cross-linguistic analysis. Today, comparative linguistics encompasses phonetics, morphology, syntax, vocabulary, and phraseology, applying methods such as contrastive and confrontational analysis. By combining synchronic and diachronic perspectives, it addresses both theoretical issues of universals and practical applications in translation and language teaching.

**KEYWORDS:** Comparative linguistics, historical linguistics, universal grammar, contrastive analysis, confrontational analysis, synchronic and diachronic approaches, language comparison, linguistic universals, grammar development, translation studies.

### INTRODUCTION

Comparative linguistics emerged in the 16th century with the creation of grammars for the national languages of Europe. These new national (or otherwise — vernacular) languages were significantly less advanced than the classical languages such as Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. However, these classical languages were still in use. There was written and spoken linguistic practice in these classical languages, primarily in the domains of religion and academia. Correspondence, books, and teaching were conducted in these languages [10,8]. At that time, national languages were not used for scientific, religious, or business communication because their vocabulary and syntax were not sufficiently developed. To bridge the gap between the expressive abilities of classical and national languages, it became necessary to compare them. This comparison was a purely academic exercise that did not involve the immediate use of acquired knowledge. Although this knowledge could be utilized later for practical purposes in the realm of language policy and education, it was not directly applied in this task. The acquired knowledge was employed in various ways in the context of national linguistic cultures across Europe.

The analysis of the differences between popular and classical languages was conducted in a structured manner. Rather than examining individual elements, the languages were compared as integrated systems. Initially, the phonetic aspects of the languages were not systematically compared, except when creating national alphabets [9]. However, this approach was not

systematic. The comparison of vocabulary and grammar was conducted in a systematic manner, and this type of comprehensive comparison later became known as comparative (contrastive) linguistics or characterology. When comparing languages comprehensively, the systematic characteristics of vocabulary and grammar are preserved.

Comparative linguistics has experienced a remarkable advancement in the field of vocabulary. The creation of glossaries for texts in ancient languages has commenced. These glossaries provide translations of challenging words from ancient texts into the native language, thereby enriching the native language with novel words and meanings [6]. As a result of the influx of borrowed words into the native language, these glossaries have been compiled into two types of dictionaries: dictionaries for individual texts and dictionaries for multiple texts. The borrowed words are organized into distinct collections, each word is explained using the resources of the native language.

Grammatical systems were compared in a similar manner. This comparison occurred in two dimensions: in the language in which the grammar was written and in the theoretical framework of grammar itself. At first, grammars in the native language were written in classical language, then grammars of classical language began to be written in native language, and by the 18th century, all languages had received grammars written in their own native language. Thus, the grammatical terminology in the native language evolved within the native language itself. In some instances, the terminology was borrowed, in others it was translated or more accurately calculated.

The composition of grammatical concepts is also being developed. When comparing different grammatical systems, a question arose about which grammatical meanings should be represented in a native language [1]. This led to a more general question about what grammatical meanings must be represented in every language. The study of this issue gave rise to a new branch of linguistics called universal grammar. Universal grammar was seen as a standard for comparing different languages. It was used to compare common, classical, and other well-known languages. Universal grammar helps to compare languages by looking at the semantics of their grammar and vocabulary.

However, due to the development of new areas of descriptive linguistics, comparisons have expanded to cover new material. Nowadays, languages are compared based on phonetics, morphology, word formation, vocabulary, phraseology, and formal and semantic syntax [5,12]. This comparative linguistics describes all the levels and aspects of a language. Therefore, the approach to establishing the basis for comparison - universal classificatory categories - is also changing. Universal categories (in modern terminology, universals of language) are distinguished based on the material representation in the compared languages [7,12]. For example, they include vowels, consonants, syllables, phonetic words, actual sentence divisions, stylistic categories of semantic syntax, types of inversions, phraseology, semantic invariants, and invariant formal models of word formation. To compare languages, equivalent texts are used. This type of research is known as confrontational analysis.

In a confrontational study, the basis for comparison is usually a formal semantic category. The significance ratio of this category is studied, and the semantics of one or more categories in one

of the compared languages may be chosen as the basis for comparison [11,4]. For instance, the meaning of a verb type category in English or Uzbek may be selected for comparison with other languages.. If the purpose of the comparison is to find the equivalents in the two languages being compared and ways to overcome any lack of equivalence in translation, for example, then this type of study is called contrastive analysis. In contrastive research, the main focus of the comparison is usually on the semantic category, meaning that the relationship between the two languages is studied. All linguistic universals can be directly or indirectly linked to this classification, and it serves as a link between comparative historical and typological research..

It can be seen from the above that comparative linguistics adapts the methods of comparing languages according to the purpose of the study. Universal grammar has explored the possibility of creating a relatively accurate translation by developing the lexical composition and syntactic structure of colloquial languages to the level of classical languages [8,3,2]. By comparing, we study the variation in the semantic possibilities of the languages being compared within the studied part of their systems. Comparative studies aim to establish translation equivalents, which makes linguistic criticism of translations and solving didactic problems in language teaching possible.

### **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, comparative linguistics not only solves the problems of the fundamental theory of language, but it also focuses on the practical application of this theory in the synchronous description of languages. The comparison of synchrony and diachrony in linguistic methods is a comparison in terms of the depth and nature of the description of linguistic phenomena. Synchronic descriptions of a language can be supported by diachronic arguments in various ways. The level of diachronic reasoning (comparative, typological, and comparative-historical) used in a synchronic analysis of a language determines the level of understanding of its structure. In turn, diachronic analysis of a language depends on the number of synchronic analyses or the lack of diachronic development. Synchrony and diachrony serve as the main methodological principles in language analysis.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Comparative linguistics and its history. (2021). ResearchJet Journal of Analysis and Inventions, 2(05), 175-180.
2. Comrie B.S Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology. – Chicago, 1981.
3. Comrie, Bernard (1999) Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. Syntax and Morphology, Basil Blackwell: Oxford
4. Joseph Salmons, 4. Bibliography of historical-comparative linguistics. Oxford Bibliographies Online.
5. Muborak Xaitbayevna Nosirova, and Diyora Xaitbayevna Akramova. "Comparative linguistics classification and analysis" Academic research in educational sciences, vol. 3, no. 1, 2022, pp. 318-321. doi:10.24412/2181-1385-2022-1-318-321

6. R.L.Trask (ed.), Dictionary of Historical and Comparative Linguistics (Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001) 6. ISBN 6. 1-57958-218-4
7. Raimo Anttila, Historical and Comparative Linguistics (Benjamins, 1989) 7. ISBN 7. 90-272-3557-0
8. Thomason S. Linguistic Areas and Language History // Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics. 2000. Vol. 28: Languages in Contact. P. 311–327.
9. Tursinaliyevna, Jabborova Zukhra (2021). 9. "Descriptive And Comparative Linguistics" (PDF). International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research. p. 5. Retrieved 22 October 2024.
10. Бурлак С.А., Старостин С.А. Введение в лингвистическую компаративистику. – М., 2001. Бурлак С.А., Старостин С.А. Сравнительно-историческое языкознание. – М., 2005.
11. Мейе А. Введение в сравнительное изучение индоевропейских языков. – М., 2009.
12. Старостин С.А. Сравнительно-историческое языкознание и лексикостатистика // Старостин С.А. Труды по языкознанию. – М.: Языки славянских культур, 2007. – С. 407–447.
13. Фортунатов Ф.Ф. Сравнительное языкознание // Избр. труды. М., 1956. Т.1.