

<p>PHILOSOPHICAL-METHODOLOGICAL BASE OF THE STUDY OF LEXICAL SYNONYMS OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE</p>		<p>Linguistics</p> <p>Keywords: Methodology, method, methodics, object of the research, subject of the research, commonness-privateness, language level, speech level, synonym.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Daniyarov Bakhtiyor Khudayberdievich</p>	<p>Navoiy State Pedagogical Institute. City Navoi, Uzbekistan.</p>
--	---

Abstract

In the article the questions identifying, limiting, classifying and explaining the concepts of methodology, method and methodics which are the basis for the development of linguistics are widely described. Also, it was analyzed that methodological base of any scientific research was very important as the ways of cognition for all the subjects. That dialectics of commonness-privateness is relied on in the process of distinguishing, separating and choosing the object of subject of the research, system features of synonyms are scientifically proven.

The development of linguistics is not just the settlement of the theoretical thoughts about the language in the historical chronology, but the change of the progress of linguistic mind, history of linguistic approaches and linguistic methodology as well. It is not easy to order this variety on the basis of a single conception and explain it in monographic scientific way. It requires the linguist being completely aware of the history of philosophical mind, socio-economical development and interdisciplinary integration. Up to the present the scientific history of language has been studied in chronological and thematic aspects only in the sources, textbooks and manuals concerning the history of linguistics. Whereas, studying the history of science separate from the history of methodology is like studying the animate creature as an inanimate one.

There lies the identification, limitation, classification and explanation of the concepts of methodology, method and methodics on the ground of studying the development of linguistics. Since, “any attempt to clarify the term of method and present their consistent classification is useful for linguistics ...” [A.T.Khrolenko 1999: 205]. Any science deals with the concepts of method, methodology and methodics. A number of works under the name of “Methods of social psychology” (2007), “Methodology of pedagogical research” (2010), “Structure and methods of natural-scientific cognition (2010), “Nature of mathematical cognition” (2006) can be given as an example. And it shows that the questions of methodology, methodics and method are big problems for all the aspects of science as the ways of cognition and the beginning of any scientific research is the realized methodological basis. Although in the 50s of the last century the methodological trends were formed in the fields of philology, science study, systemology, linguistics and literature study of the world science, [New philosophical encyclopedia. 2010.2:554], it is a pity that as if the concept of “methodology” was odd to our linguistics, as if it was not the problem for the linguists, generally, methodology was not absolutely necessary for linguistics, what’s more, considered to be extra. Whereas, not only the scientific research, but also even any human activity was not possible without methodology. Therefore, it can be said that Uzbek linguistics also has never been separate from methodology.

In Russian linguistics methodics, methodology and methods of linguistic research have been studied and there are significant works as well. [B.A.Serebrennikov [edit.] (2009)]; [V.I.Kodukhov (1974)]; [Yu.S.Stepanov (1975)]; [F.M.Berezin and B.N.Golovin (1979)]; [A.Ye.Karlinskiy (2009)]. Particularly, in the work “General linguistics. Methods of linguistics research” (B.A.Serebrennikov, 2009) methodology and the significance of linguistic methodics is specially explained. Since, “It is one of the basic questions of general linguistics. Certain methods in any period of the history may influence on the nature of common development of linguistics too” [B.A.Serebrennikov, 2009, 5). The scholar gave valuable information about linguo-genetic method, linguo-geographical method; structural analysis method, typological method, synchronic and diachronic analysis methods. The linguist also explained that linguistic research methods were the basis for naming the linguistic trends, theories and approaches. But any kind of method is alive with methodics. In other words, Methodics is the process and way of using the method. Many methods still have not their own complete methodics.

In the last chapter of his work the linguist talked about methodology. Exactly, he distinguishes the concepts “linguistics is the general methodology of science” and specific methods of linguistic researches”. On this base he put the distinguishing criteria of methodology in the following thesis:

- “1) The characteristic of science is a try to establish a compact and organic relations between its general methodology and specific methods of research;
- 2) General methodology of science functions as an acting power in scientific researches;
- 3) General philosophy of the modern sciences is a dialectical-materialistic approach to know the events of nature and society”. (B.A.Serebrennikov, 2009, 257).

We would like to mention from the point of view of pluralism of today that the scholar’s third thesis is limited in a certain degree and it is impossible to refuse that every ideological level occurs as a methodological factor. Because, the principle of tolerance in our national ideology requires objective attitude towards various approaches.

In this chapter the scholar reveals the axiomatic of a certain scientific-research method. He focuses on the three systems of the method in it:

- 1) Theory of method;
- 2) Collection of scientific-research techniques whose contents are defined by the linguistic basis of the method;
- 3) Collection of technical ways and practices [B.A.Serebrennikov, 2009, 260].

Theory of method includes three parts:

- 1) Linguistic base of the method;
- 2) Methodics of using scientific-research techniques;

3) Basis of theory of general cognition [B.A.Serebrennikov, 2009, 261].

Of course, it is known that the theory of method is in linguistic meaning here. Linguistic base of the method is important for us. It should be considered that it consists of three parts:

- 1) Necessity of using the method; 2) linguistic problem; 3) linguistic solution, result.
- 2)

Because one method cannot always be used the same for all the language levels. For example, the oppositive method, which is used in phonetics, cannot be used in stylistics.

Generally, it can be said on the basis of the difference of language and speech, that methods, first of all, are differentiated according to which levels they belong to:

- 1) The methods used to research the phenomena of language levels;
- 2) The methods used to research the phenomena of speech levels.

There is a system of methods used for each level. We can see some notes about the use of any method in the works dedicated to research the language and speech levels in Uzbek linguistics today. If the appropriate paragraphs of the dissertations being defended are observed and compared, we can easily be sure about it. Indistinguishability of methods should be considered by the followings:

Firstly, the writer doesn't always think of the methods he used and therefore "the system of methods" moves from dissertations to dissertations;

Secondly, it is not important to gain any practical result for the research and not required to consider and use these methods.

We would like to finish B.A.Serebrennikov's opinions about the linguistic basis of the theory of method with the followings. In order to use the method consciously:

- 1) On which level the research is being conducted;
- 2) Which aspect of the language is being researched;
- 3) Definite conclusions the research gives should be consciously understood. Generally, the object and the problem whose solution is necessary in it, and the scientific thought about the entirety of its practical (in our opinion, social) results are the linguistic basis of the method.

Of course, it should be kept in mind that any method means a certain technical practice. For example, summarizing, classifying the theoretical materials, copying the examples onto the cards, grouping or sorting them are among them. But this method and technique is demanded not to confuse.

The event of any existence, the object of study is comprehensive. No researcher can ever completely involve all the aspects of the object of the study. That's why two phenomena is distinguished in science and science study:

- 1) The object of study; 2) the subject of study.

The object of study is understood in two ways in Uzbek science study:

- 1) The phenomenon being researched (studied);
- 2) the source in which the phenomenon being researched is met.

There should be a relationship of commonness and privateness between the object and subject of the research. For this the researcher should learn the dialectics of commonness and privateness at the level that he can apply to distinguish the object and subject of study. It is known, “a single essence is a category that expresses relative isolation, discreteness, delimitation from each other in space and time of objects defining them to specific features that make up their unique qualitative and quantitative certainty” [A.G.Spirkin, 1988, 202].

Apparently, the privateness is directly visible. And it shows that “it is impossible to study” the commonness – the object of study which is not directly given in observation. Because it is impossible to involve the object of study and if any aspect of it is left, it appears not as the object of study, but as the subject of study. Since, “the common is one in many ways. No activity, no science would be possible, if objectively there was no possibility of isolating something common in things. It expresses certain properties and relationships characteristic for a given class of objects or events. How the similarity of the signs of things is common to direct perception” [A.G.Spirkin, 1988, 202].

Thus, it will be known that under the specificities there lies commonness. And it shows as we mentioned above that there could be countless subjects of study in one object of study. For example, there cannot be a research theme like “Cases in the Uzbek language”. Because, only the object of study is reflected in it, the problem – the subject of study, which is solved by a certain researcher is not reflected. ...in the subject of study the problem which should be solved is reflected. In the theme above this problem doesn't find its reflection – the subject of the research is not shown.

Of course, “between commonness and essence it is impossible to put a sign of equality, because the commonness, characterizing a rather high degree of prevalence of quality or property, doesn't correlate with the whole essence of the object as with some systematically organized purposes but only with one attribute of this purpose” [A.G.Spirkin, 1988, 203]. In fact, commonness and essence are not equal. For example, the above mentioned theme “Cases in the

Uzbek language” is the generality of a number of researches conducted on many features of the cases, that’s this part in the theme, is repeated, the second part (the subject of study) will change:

- 1) “Cases in the Uzbek language (1) their formal features(2)”;
- 2) “Cases in the Uzbek language (1) their structural features (2)”;
- 3) “Cases in the Uzbek language (1) their stylistic features (2)”;
- 4) “Cases in the Uzbek language (1) their linguopoetic features (2)”;
- 5) “Cases in the Uzbek language (1) their linguocognitive features (2)”;
- 6) “Cases in the Uzbek language (1) their linguopsychological features (2)”;
- 7) “Cases in the Uzbek language (1) their linguomethodic features (2)”...

The first part of the themes in the given examples is unchangeable and common for all the rest seven parts. But this commonness is not an essence at all. In the Uzbek language not the cases, but the semantics of the cases “subordinating the previous word to the next” is the essence [Kh.Nigmatov, 1989,]. On the contrary, the essence of the theme is seen in its subject of study. And it shows that is not equal to the category of essence-phenomenon, but even opposite too. And it shows that the above mentioned note taken from A.G.Spirkin is very correct. A.G.Spirkin proves it like this. Human is the only creature in the world whose lower part of its ears is soft. This is a common feature for all the humans. But it doesn’t comprise the essence of all the humans. Because, if the essence changes, the thing cannot be that thing.

In distinguishing, separating and choosing the object and subject of the theme the dialectics of commonness-privateness is relied on. It is known that commonness and privateness occur in two ways and shouldn’t be forgotten which one of them is particular to which case.

In restoring the essence of things and events the relationship of these categories appears in privateness→commonness form. Choosing the subject of study in the theme happens on the basis of the principle of commonness→privateness. Because if the object of study is not ready, then the subject of study is out of question. B.A.Serebrennikov proved it by the concept of “aspect” and showed its significance in linguistic researches. Since, the phenomenon of the language being studied is multi-aspected and complex, the researcher can never completely involve the object, just decides to study only one aspect itself, and avoids taking phenomenon wholly. The side involved for this research is called “aspect”. For example, system features of synonyms is “its system aspect”, the peculiarity of making a text is “its aspect of making a text”. Apparently, the sides of the object of study are unlimited, then its aspects of study are unlimited too. Actually, one aspect is enough for one research [B.A.Serebrennikov, 2009, 266].

Common research methods and private linguistic research methods are distinguished. Common research methods are characterized by their usage in many fields, and the private methods are significant by their usage in a narrow field, particularly, in linguistics. As a result, it

seems to be necessary to separate “big” and “small” methods. Big method or methods comprise methodology.

B.A.Serebrennikov considering philosophical method as methodology, divided its two components:

- 1) general laws of the universe (ontological basis of method);
- 2) general laws of cognition (social basis of method) [B.A.Serebrennikov, 2009, 272].

The first laws have absolutely objective characters, the human learns it and subjectivity is connected with their wrong, incomplete or insufficient understanding. For example, in language synonyms exist in language system on the basis of absolutely objective laws. But still whether they are language paradigm or not is remaining a problem. [Ye.S.Kubryakova, 2008, 4-14]. In some sources they are considered as paradigm [R.Sayfullaeva, B.Mengliev, 2009], in some as language line [B.Mengliev, 2019]. General laws of cognition also exist like the general laws of the universe, but because their existence is the result of human psychology, can be said partially subjective. General laws of cognition sometimes have the feature of being governed. Formal, dialectical or synergetic study of the language phenomena are, firstly, connected with socio-economical ideology and secondly, are also defined by the general developing state of the science of the time and the general integration degree of sciences.

The aim of every research is to make a generalization. Thus, it is impossible to be a science without finding generality – making a generalization. Philosophy of making a generalization is the basis of linguistic researches too. It is known, generalization is one of the important ideal practices of a man in knowing and investigating the reality; the process of uniting the similar and important features and connections of things and events in a certain ideal concept and its result. Observation, experiment, theoretical mind also lead to generalization. Generalization is an important means of scientific cognition. In generalization transforming from privateness into commonness (for example, transforming from the concept “speech meaning” into the concept of “semema”) and a general concept, a decision, a theory come into existence (face – is the front part of a person’s head from the forehead to the chin); an apple, a pear, an apricot are hyponyms). The general knowledge gained from such concepts reflect the linguistic world deeply and help to understand its essence. Without generalizing the concepts about the language, and the knowledge concerning them, it is impossible to create the categories of linguistics, it is impossible to categorizing the language. It is impossible to systemize the linguistic knowledge, come to a certain conclusion and make a decision without generalizing. Linguistics and command of language cannot develop without generalizing. All the linguistic categories, the laws, rules, definitions and principles, represented by means of them, linguistic empiric concepts gained in the experiment are made as a result generalizing [UzNE, 2005, 9, 99]. It can be said as a conclusion that methodological and methodic problems of Uzbek linguistics haven’t found their complete investigations yet. Therefore in the formation of researches and in the forms of representing them some deficiencies are met and these deficiencies

are defined by the incompleteness. That's why the role and significance of methodology (philosophy) is still actual. Whereas, as the outstanding linguist H.Nematov said, each period of time puts certain requirements in front of its science. The leading philosophical idea of the time shows the science which aspects of the object of study should be focused on. Its power and methodological significance are in this [Ҳ.Неъматов, 1989, 3].

References

1. Березин Ф.М., Головин Б.Н. Общее языкознание: Учебное пос. для студентов по специальности «Русский язык и литература». – М.: Просвещение, 1979.
2. Карлинский А.Е. Методология и парадигмы современной лингвистики. – Алматы: Изд-во КазУМОпМЯ, 2009. – 352 с.
3. Кодухов В.И. Общее языкознание: Учебник для студентов филол.специальностей. – М.: Высшая школа, 1974
4. Кубрякова Е.С. Понятие «парадигма» в лингвистике: Введение // Парадигмы научного знания в современной лингвистике. – М.: РАН ИНИОН, 2008-б. – С. 4-14.
5. Менглиев Б. Ҳозирги ўзбек тили: Дарслик. – Тошкент: Тафаккур бўстони, 2019.
6. Методология педагогического исследования: Учебник для бакалавриата. – М.: Юрайт, 2018.
7. Методы социальной психологии: Учебное пособие для вузов. – М.: Академический проект, 2007.
8. Неъматов Ҳ. Бозоров О. Тил ва нутқ. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи 1989.
9. Нигматов Х.Г. Функциональная морфология тюркоязычных памятников XI-XII вв. – Ташкент: Фан, 1989.
10. Новая философская энциклопедия. – М.: Мысль, 2010.
11. Общее языкознание. Методы лингвистических исследований (под ред. Б.А.Серебренникова. – М.: Наука, 2009.
12. Природа математического познания. – М.: Мысл, 2006.
13. Сайфуллаева Р. Менглиев Б., Боқиева Г. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. –Тошкент: ФТ, 2009.
14. Спиркин А.Г. Основы философии: Учеб.пособие для вузов. – М.: Политиздат, 1988.
15. Степанов Ю.С. Методы и принципы современной лингвистики (1975, Изд. 7-е. – М.: Изд-во ЛКИ, 2009)
16. Структураи методи естественного познания// https://studme/org>struktura_estest...
17. Ўзбекистон Миллий энциклопедияси. 9-том. –Тошкент: ЎзМЭ, 2005.
18. Хроленко А.Т. Общее языкознание. Курс лекций. Учебное пособие для студентов: - Курск: Изд-во Курского госуниверситета, 1999.
19. <https://www.livelib.ru/quote/4265122>].