

Linguistic methodology and its interpretation

Author(s), AKHMADJONOVA MAKHFUZA EGAMKULOVNA



Abstract:

Within the article, the methodological framework and the concept of a special linguistic method are scientifically justified in linguistics, which are interrelated and interrelated.

IJARBAS

Accepted 1 March 2020

Published 11 March 2020

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3708499

Keywords:

Methodology, gnoseological and methodological basis, ontological basis, object and subject,



About Author

Author(s), Teachers of the department of elementary education of
Kokand State Pedagogical Institute,
Republic of Uzbekistan.



Introduction

According to Karl Jaspers, the true science must be able to accurately represent the complex of knowledge and limits of knowledge. Indeed, any science has two important aspects: the research object and the methods and methods of scientific analysis of the research object (Baxtishodovich, Suyunovich, News, & 2017, n.d.; Kalpakjian & Schmid, 2014; Kandiyoti, 2003; Morrison, 2009; Piven & PAK, 2006). At the present time, some research in linguistics fails to identify the research object, the gnoseological and methodological basis of the work, due to insufficient attention to these aspects. However, it is the methodology that guides the basis of voluntary research and the overall research strategy. In fact, as in the above studies, the ontological, gnoseological, and methodological aspects of the work are implicitly reflected, but sometimes scientists do not explicitly cover the same methodology in their research. As the ontological basis of the study is weak, many studies present theoretically more controversial.

The methodological basis and the concept of special linguistic methodology are dialectically interrelated concepts in linguistics, which are inextricably linked and, in turn, essentially different. However, in most cases these two concepts are used in a complex and confusing manner. In our words, in a word, method is tactic, methodology is strategy. According to the scientist who developed the methodology of natural sciences in the 17th century, F. Bacon, the scientific method is like a lamp that illuminates the path to the passenger in the dark. L. Vygotsky likens the methodology to "the skeleton that holds the whole organism."

In linguistics, methodology (from the Greek *methodos* - "path", "method" and *logos* - derived from the words "science", "doctrine") is understood in the following meanings: 1)



system of elementary principles and special methods of language study; 2) Principles of activity and experience in linguistics, the main criteria for selecting and studying object of research, teaching about meta-moral values.

Methodology in linguistics includes 3 components: a) General philosophical methodology - set of laws determining the orientation, directions and principles of research in all disciplines. Such as dialectics or synergetics; 2) General methodology - a set of methods and principles used in a number of disciplines, in particular linguistics. For example, modeling, induction, deduction; 3) Private methodology (special linguistic methodology) - a set of methods used in a certain science (linguistics). For example, typological, comparative, historical, and structural techniques that are actively used in linguistics.

Methodology defines the approach to the object of research in linguistics, the relationship between the object and the subject of research, the ways in which scientific knowledge is formed, the general orientation and character of linguistic research, and the various methods and methods of language research. It, to a certain extent, predetermines the scientific implications of linguistic research and the future progress and future of science inextricably linked to existing theories in linguistics. The development of each discipline depends on the methodology on which it is based.

The use of one or the other methods and techniques in the process of research determines the research methodology. However, sometimes there are cases where methodology and methodology mix, which are essentially different concepts. For a long time, the essence of methodology in linguistics has been explained solely by philosophy and interpreted in the interests of the dominant ideology. At present there are various interpretations of linguistic methodology, which can be divided into philosophical,



ideological, theoretical, disciplinary, diachronic, and ethnic interpretations, summarizing all views on it.

1. Philosophical interpretation of methodology - understanding of methodology as philosophical doctrine, more precisely, philosophical method and worldview. If the linguist considers the existence of a language or speech in a heap of speech evidence, that is, in the sounds, letters, texts, he is a phenomenist; it is metaphysical when the language categories favor the representation of the language system in an ideal or realistic way. If the linguist is in a strict anthropocentric position and believes that the existence of a language is caused by the mentality or mentality of the people, we can say that he is a mentalist. According to the methodological bases of linguistic scholars, this grouping can be continued under different names: factualists and sensualists; idealists and empiricists; such as rationalists and irrationalists.

2. The ideological interpretation of methodology is to define a methodology in the interests of a particular ideology. An example of this is the case of Soviet linguistics as the only true and promising methodology of dialectical materialism or perception theory, and idealism as a methodology of error and error based on bourgeois ideology. In fact, scientific methodology should be free from any ideological dogmas and stereotypes.

3. Theoretical interpretation of methodology means that the existing theories, currents, and doctrines in linguistics are recognized as theoretical foundations and guidelines for further research. In this regard, linguistics can refer to descriptivistic, bibehavioristic, generative-transformative, cognitive methodologies. In this sense, the term "methodological foundations of linguistic research" is often used side by side with their notion of "theoretical basis", but they are not identical concepts. It is important to remember that although some theories have a



unified methodological basis, they can be based on conflicting theoretical interpretations. For example, the methodological basis of theories such as glossematics, descriptivism, and functionalism is structuralism and systemology, but they differ in the interpretation of language phenomena.

4. The disciplinary interpretation of methodology refers to the most important aspects and priorities that linguists or the whole linguistic school operate in. For example, linguistics is sociological (sociolinguistic), psychological (psycholinguistic), logical methodology (A. Heinz), systemological or dynamic methodology (E. Yudin), semisociological or onomasiological methodology (V. Danilenko, 1993; L. Zubkova, 1988), name. , Methodology of predicate or egocentric words (linguistic philosophy) (D. Rudenko, 1993), semiotic methodology (Ch. Morris) demonstrating the dominance of semantics, syntactics and pragmatics. According to this interpretation, existing directions in linguistics are grouped into specific groups, depending on the priority of methodological principles. Linguistics can be divided into principles of formalism or functionality (F. Newmeyer, 1996): Listening linguistics (semiological or descriptive linguistics) and speech linguistics (onomasiological or explanatory linguistics).

5. The diachronic interpretation of methodology is connected with the name of the famous scientist T. Kun. According to this interpretation, scientific paradigms are periodically interchangeable, with a time-based methodology then shifting its position to another methodology. If there are two such paradigms, their change will be like a pendulum vibration (P. Parshin), and if there are three, they will rotate with each other (D. Rudenko) or spirally.

(Yu. Stepanov) If they are infinitely large, then they alternate (T. Kun).

P. Parshin described the shift of linguistic paradigms using the concepts of "tradition" -



“modern” - “postmodern”. There is a definite scientific paradigm at the stage of tradition, while in the modern stage it is rejected - a new paradigm is shattered by tradition, and in the postmodern stage, the traditional paradigm is re-justified and old and new paradigms come into play.

6. Ethnic interpretation of the methodology is to explain certain doctrines, schools or directions in this subject, and their methodological basis in relation to a particular nation or territory. Examples include American School of Structuralism, French Functionalism, Soviet Linguistics, Kazan School of Linguistics, Prague School of Structuralism, Copenhagen School of Structuralism, Vienna Circle, Tashkent School of Linguistics, Samarkand Linguistics School, Andijan School of Linguistics.

Conclusion

It is important to remember that scientists who rely on different methodological positions can also be grouped together on the basis of spatial unity. In particular, L. Elmslev and O. Espersen may be united in the Copenhagen circle, but both scientists have developed different methodological paradigms. Or V. Matezius, V. Skalichka and R. Jacobson were active members of the Prague linguistic circle, but they were not in the same methodological position.



References

- Baxtishodovich, B., Suyunovich, T., News, A. K.-W. S., & 2017, undefined. (n.d.). The start-up of tourism in Central Asia Case of Uzbekistan. *Infona.Pl*. Retrieved from <https://www.infona.pl/resource/bwmeta1.element.psjd-b0bae11d-b866-4574-95a1-799eafccc3cd>
- Kalpajian, S., & Schmid, S. (2014). Manufacturing engineering and technology. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Vijay_Sekar2/publication/262156319_Manufacturing_Engineering_and_Technology/links/00b49536c9c352428b000000.pdf
- Kandiyoti, D. (2003). The Cry for Land: Agrarian Reform, Gender and Land Rights in Uzbekistan. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 3(1-2), 225-256. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0366.00055>
- Morrison, A. (2009). *Russian Rule in Samarkand 1868-1910: A Comparison with British India*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199547371.001.0001>
- Piven, G., & PAK, I. (2006). Higher Education in Kazakhstan and the Bologna Process. *Russian Education & Society*, 48(10), 82-91. <https://doi.org/10.2753/RES1060-9393481007>



Cite this article:

Author(s), AKHMADJONOVA MAKHFUZA EGAMKULOVNA (2020). **Title:** “Linguistic methodology and its interpretation”. **Name of the Journal:** International Journal of Academic Research in Business, Arts and Science, (IJARBAS.COM), P, 137-146. DOI: [www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3708499](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3708499) , Issue: 3, Vol.: 2, Article: 13, Month: March, Year: 2020. Retrieved from <https://www.ijarbas.com/all-issues/>

Published by

