



AMERICAN AND BRITAIN STRUCTURALISM

Ganiyeva Kamilla Shavkatovna

Student of MA Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Annotation: This article is devoted to the study of some key aspects of appearance and development of the structural linguistics in USA and Great Britain in the 20th century.

Keywords: Structuralism, direction, study, schools, linguistics.

Structuralism is an interdisciplinary direction in the social sciences of the XX century, which united various trends based on the study of structures, the use of linguistic models for the analysis of society and culture, on the principles of objectivism and holism. The term “structuralism” itself began to be used in the 1920s, and it can be attributed to a number of approaches to describing the language that existed at that time (although there are slightly different dates of events in the specialized literature). As it is known, the structural direction did not arise in any one country or region. On the contrary, several schools existed in parallel. So, there are American structuralism, Prague, Copenhagen, London schools. However, the fact remains indisputable that the theoretical basis was laid by Ferdinand de Saussure and his Course of General linguistics, thus determining the course of development of all trends and directions of structuralism.[1]

Due to the fact that during the period of John Rupert Firth’s research activity, structuralism and, above all, the American school were the dominant trends in linguistics, it is necessary to focus further on this area of linguistics. In addition, Firth repeatedly addressed the consideration and analysis of this section of linguistics.

At the end of the 20s, descriptive linguistics emerged and actively developed in the general mainstream of structural linguistics in the USA, Descriptivism - the direction of American linguistics of the 1920s-1950s. L. Bloomfield is considered the founder of Descriptivism and its main theorist. Leonard Bloomfield is an American linguist, professor, one of the founders of the descriptive direction of structural linguistics. One of the outstanding linguists of the XX century. Works on Indo-European studies, Tagalog, Algonquian languages, general morphology, general theory of language.

The formation of the concept of Descriptivism was decisively influenced by the research practice of US scientists who studied the languages and cultures of American Indians. These languages could only be described synchronously, the researchers had no data on their history; the division of texts into words caused great difficulties, many grammatical and lexical meanings turned out to be incomprehensible, the researcher could not freely master the studied language due to the great difference in cultures and had to constantly address questions to its native speaker-informant.[2] The main differences between descriptive linguistics in general and distributive linguistics in particular from the European trends of structuralism are as follows: reliance on the philosophical systems of positivism and pragmatism and the psychology of behaviorism; Descriptive linguistics arose as a reaction to the inadequacy of traditional (essentially logical) grammar focused on the description of the Latin language and the languages of Europe, and the inapplicability of the comparative historical method with his concepts of sound laws and changes by analogy to the description of numerous Indian languages.

Distributive analysis is carried out in the “bottom-up” direction, first on the phonological, and then on the morphological. A sophisticated, highly formalized system of experimental “detection” techniques is being developed the language system in the texts. Descriptive linguistics (in a broad sense) has had a significant impact on other linguistic trends in America and on world linguistics. Descriptivists have made a huge contribution to the development of procedures for precise formal analysis of language and the use of methods of logic and mathematics. They have enriched the world linguistics with numerous terms.[3]

At the same time, the London School, according to J. Joseph is distinguished by the priority she gives to form over meaning. The founder of the London School, the British scientist John Rupert Truss, approached the systematic consideration of language in a very special way. “For Truss, the language was polysystem, including an infinite number of interconnected microsystems that intertwine at traditional levels of analysis”. [4] Some provisions of the theory of “Londoners” regarding the study of structure are as follows:

- “when analyzing a language, the concepts of system and structure should be distinguished. The first is established as a result of abstraction at the paradigmatic level, the second — at the level of syntagmatics.
- it is advisable to start the study with consideration of higher levels of linguistic structure and gradually move on to the analysis of lower levels ...
- functional and structural analysis are logically dependent, since structural analysis is primarily an analysis of relations, the main content of which is the study functional connections[5].

English structuralism was represented by the activities of linguists of the London School of Linguistics, who sought to create a general theory of language, within which it would be possible to find an explanation for specific cases and features of any language. They sought to develop methods of structural and functional research of various living languages. John Rupert Firth devoted the following articles “Structural linguistics” “Descriptive linguistics and the study of English” to the structural direction of linguistics.

Firth's work “Descriptive Linguistics and the study of the English language” offers us a scientist's view on the content of the discipline of descriptive linguistics, as well as his method of language learning. He considered descriptive linguistics to be one of the aspects of general linguistics, whose main task is to describe meanings in linguistic terms.[6]

The study of the English language, according to Firth, includes a whole range of possibilities, which, however, must be reduced to certain circumstances and then the data obtained can be applied in language teaching. Hence the term "limited language". Limited languages function in certain situations inherent to them, for example, technical languages for industries, aviation, military service, politics, trade, etc. They are characterized by special forms of writing, vocabulary, grammar, style. [7]

Based on the above, it can be concluded that, although the London School is traditionally referred to as a structural trend, there are noticeable differences in these directions, since J.R. Firth also proposed to study the language using a level-by-level analysis. Speech was not perceived in Britain only as a form of human behavior. At the same time, the connection of the problem of meaning with the context of culture correlates the ideas of Firth with ethnolinguistics.[8]

Unlike the views of American linguists of the structural direction, English structuralism, represented by the activities of linguists of the London School, did not perceive a person's speech only as a form of his behavior. However, the level-by-level analysis of the language proposed by Firth makes it possible to traditionally attribute the London School to structuralism.

REFERENCE:

1. Matthews P.A. Short History of Structural Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 143 p.
2. Joseph J. E. Trends in Twentieth-Century Linguistics: an Overview. Concise History of the Language Sciences: from the Sumerians to the Cognitivists / Ed. by E. F. K. Koerner, R. E. Asher, Oxford: Pergamon, 1995. P. 88.
3. Khamidova N. N. Speech exercises as a necessary component of the formation of the communicative personality of students in teaching foreign languages”. Английский язык в сфере профессиональной Коммуникации vii всероссийская молодежная научная конференция Kazan. 2021
4. Matthews P. Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. P. 226
5. Nelyubin L.L., Khukhuni G.T. Istoriyanauki o yazyke: uchebnik [The history of the language Science: a tutorial]. Moscow, Flint Publ., Nauka Publ., 2008. P. 226
6. Khamidova N. N. “The Development of a Semiotic Point of View in Structural Linguistics”. European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science 4, p. 545-547, 2022
7. Langendoen D.T. The Views of J. Lyons in Structural Semantics. Appendix. The London School of Linguistics: a Study of the Linguistic Theories of B. Malinowski and J.R. Firth. Cambridge, Massachusetts: the M.I.T. Press, 1968. P. 156
8. Khamidova N. N. Features of phraseological units in linguoculture. Современные проблемы филологии, педагогики и методики преподавания языков. Сборник научных трудов по итогам всероссийской научно-практической конференции. Kazan. 2020