



EFFECTS OF LINGUISTIC COMPLEXITY IN LANGUAGE EVOLUTION

Go'zalxon Abdiganiyeva

Teacher of department of "Philology"

ISFT Institute

adganiyevaguzalxon@gmail.com

ANNOTATION

Phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic complexity are some of the subtopics that make up the linguistics theme of language complexity. The subject is crucial for the development of language. Compared to many other conventional disciplines of linguistics, the complexity of language has received less research. Although there is general agreement that complexity is a viable topic for research, methodological decisions are the main focus. In particular, pidgins and creoles are thought to be simpler than other languages, but there is no standard method for comparing and evaluating them, despite the fact that multiple options have recently been put out by various schools of thought.

ANNOTATSIYA

Fonologik, morfologik, sintaktik va semantik murakkablik til murakkabligining tilshunoslik mavzusini tashkil etuvchi kichik mavzulardir. Mavzu tilni rivojlantirish uchun hal qiluvchi ahamiyatga ega. Tilshunoslikning boshqa ko'plab an'anaviy fanlari bilan taqqoslaganda, tilning murakkabligi kamroq tadqiq qilingan. Murakkablik tadqiqot uchun hayotiy mavzu ekanligi haqida umumiy kelishuv mavjud bo'lsa-da, uslubiy qarorlar asosiy e'tibordir. Xususan, pidjinlar va kreollar boshqa tillarga qaraganda soddaroq deb hisoblanadilar, ammo yaqinda turli tafakkur maktablari tomonidan bir nechta variantlar ilgari surilganiga qaramay, ularni taqqoslash va baholashning standart usuli mavjud emas.

KEY WORDS: complex grammar, language norms, linguistic complexity, syntagmatic complexity, paradigmatic complexity, organizational complexity, measuring complexity.

Differential complexity was taken for granted during the 19th century. Greek and Latin are both classical languages, both Sanskrit and other languages were seen to offer



features that the developing national languages of Europe could only match by undergoing an expansion that would give them the structural and lexical complexity needed to meet the standards of an enlightened civilization. At the same time, it was common knowledge that people who spoke “primitive” languages were straightforward people. In the 20th century, linguists and anthropologists adopted a view that rejected any nationalistic ideas about the supremacy of state languages. The first known citation for the idea that all languages are equally complex is from For example, the 1971 edition of the Guinness Book of World Records listed language, as “the most complex language in the world.” Linguists believe that this assertion “not based on any substantial evidence” and was dropped from later editions. A balancing force, whereby simplicity in one domain is compensated by complexity in another, has been proposed as an explanation for apparent complexity disparities in particular fields. Every language has a complex grammar; while some may be very simple others always seem to be relatively complex (e.g., word position).

Language norms, which show the convergence of idiolectal systems with structures that are more similar to one another, are a communal feature of language complexity. It can be categorized as social or complexity of social interaction associated with several habitats that the speakers use to govern their mutual understanding while lessening their individuality. It was pointed out the ridiculousness of the notion that when languages change, each one must contain a mechanism to calibrate it to the complexity of the other 6,000 or so languages in the world in 2001, therefore ending the compensation hypothesis. He noted that no such mechanism was known in linguistics. Revisiting the idea of differential complexity, it was argued that it was indeed the case that creoles such as Saramaccan were structurally much simpler than all the older languages. According to McWhorter, this is not an issue from the perspective of the equivalence of creole languages because simple structures most directly represent logical meanings, whereas language complexity is primarily those that do not add much to functionality or is a matter of features that do not improve utility. Integral possessive marking, transitive reference marking, syntactic asymmetries between matrix and subordinate clauses, grammatical gender, and other secondary traits that are often missing from creoles are a few examples of such features. It's likely that is to reviewed of 19th-century theories about the relationship



between language contact and complexity and other forms of communication undermines “natural” combinations of complexity.

A language's complexity can be broadly defined as the quantity and variety of its elements as well as the sophistication of the structure of how those elements interact. This broad description is subdivided into the following categories: Syntagmatic complexity: the number of phonemes, syllables, and other components that make up a word. Paradigmatic complexity: the variety of parts, e.g. the size of the phoneme inventory, the number of variations in a grammatical category, e.g. aspect Organizational complexity, such as different word order options, limits on how components can be arranged, etc. Measuring complexity - Comparing complete natural languages is a challenging process, and measuring complexity is thought to be tough. Some structures can be demonstrated to be more complicated than others at a more in-depth level. There have historically been analogies made between phonology and morphology. For instance, there are methods for analyzing the phonological structure of any language in linguistics. Grammatical rules have been suggested as a framework for the study of syntactic complexity, although generative frameworks like the minimalist program and the Simpler syntax framework have had less success in discovering complexity and related predictions than informal methods. Many researchers suggest that several different concepts may be needed when approaching complexity: entropy, size, description length, effective complexity, information, connectivity, irreducibility, low probability, syntactic depth etc. According to the research, it is suggested that while methodological choices affect the results, even rather crude analytic tools may provide a feasible starting point for measuring grammatical complexity.

REFERENCES

1. Carr, J., Smith, K., Cornish, H., & Kirby, S. The cultural evolution of structured languages in an open-ended, continuous world. *Cognitive Science*. 2016.
2. Dahl, O. The growth and maintenance of linguistic complexity, 2004, P. 71.
3. Dirven, R. and Verspoor, M. *Cognitive Explorations of Language and Linguistics*. John Benjamins. (2004)



4. Davies, B.L. Testing dialogue principles in task-oriented dialogues: An exploration of cooperation, collaboration, effort and risk. Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics, 2006. p. 30–64.
5. Gell-Mann, M. Effective complexity. In M. Gell-Mann & S. Lloyd (Eds.), *Nonextensive entropy – interdisciplinary applications*. 2003. pp. 387–398.
6. K. Smith. *Cultural evolution: implications for understanding the human language faculty and its evolution*. 2018.
7. Khoo, C.S.G., & Na, J.C. Semantic relations in information science. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, 40, 2006. pp. 157– 228.
8. Larkoff. *An overview of Cognitive Linguistics*. 1987.
9. Lakoff, "Invariance hypothesis: is abstract reasoning based on image-schemas?". *Cognitive Linguistics*. 1990.

INTERNET RESOURCES

1. <https://cte.univsetif2.dz/moodle/mod/book/tool/print/index.php>.
(Accessed 25.05.2022)
2. https://www.google.com/search?q=CULTURAL+VOLUTION+OF+LINGUISTIC+STRUCTURE&rlz=1C1GCEA_enUZ934UZ934&oq=CULTURAL+VOLUTION+OF+LINGUISTIC+STRUCTURE&aqs=chrome..69i57j33i10i160j33i10i22i29i30.31540j0j15&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8&bshm=nce/1
3. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culture_and_social_cognition#:~:text=Cultural%20cognitive%20evolution%20proposes%20that,by%20about%20six%20million%20years . (Accessed 27.05.2022)
4. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.soc.23.1.263>
(Accessed 27.05.2022)
5. https://home.csulb.edu/~cwallis/382/readings/482/text/history_outline.pdf (Accessed 28.05.2022)



6. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linguistics> (Accessed 29.05.2022)

7. <https://www.daytranslations.com/blog/relationship-between-language-and-culture/> (Accessed 04.06.2022)