

COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AS AN INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY

Baxramova Dilovarxon Gazanfarovna*; **Vaxidova Anastasiya Abdusamiyevna****

*Teacher of Spanish and Italian Languages Department,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Samarkand, UZBEKISTAN

**Teacher of Spanish and Italian Languages Department,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Samarkand, UZBEKISTAN

Email id: Mamatkulovaferuza11@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2022.00123.9

ABSTRACT

Before analyzing certain orientations presented by the mentioned disciplines, we will present some reflections on the nature of the acquisition of a language. Linguistic knowledge covers different aspects of phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, semantic and pragmatic nature that any human being acquires under normal physical, psychological and social conditions. All this is justified first by the indisputable fact of the acquisition of the native language.

KEYWORDS: *Native Language, Multidisciplinary Research, Linguistic Relativism, Grammatical Categories.*

INTRODUCTION

We can recognize that the acquisition of the native language is a universal cognitive process, inherent to the human condition. The ability of language, materialized in the acquisition of native language, is a complex and specialized skill, which develops spontaneously in the child, without conscious effort and without formal instruction, and which is qualitatively equal to all individuals. How is linguistic knowledge achieved? What is its nature? What functions of the brain operate to carry out this knowledge? From the 70th of the XX century, multidisciplinary research, combining procedures taken from linguistics, psychology, sociology, philosophy and biology, begins to study the complex process of acquisition and learning of language capacity.

The thesis of linguistic relativism (also known as the Sapir-Whorf thesis) in its strictest version proposes that our view of the world is shaped by the structure of our language, or in other words, by the different grammatical categories and constructions (nominal classifiers, casual paradigms, tense and verbal aspect, number, etc.). In this way, according to the theory of linguistic relativism, our worldview is fundamentally constructed unconsciously according to our linguistic behavior. Whorf's well-known claim that language determines thought has often been rejected on the pretext that there is no clear evidence that linguistic structures actually influence the categorization habits of speakers. In recent decades there have been numerous studies that have tried to validate the hypothesis of linguistic relativism and many of them constitute valuable contributions to semantic research [1, p.143]. Of all, it is worth mentioning here two that seem

especially suitable for the purposes of this work: the behavior of Korean and English children in relation to the manipulation of objects studied by Choi and Bowerman and the intercultural study of the category of grammatical number in Yucatec by Lucy [2, p.100].

One of the research that has had the greatest echo in the last decade is that carried out by Choi and Bowerman with Korean and English children of about twenty months. At this age, which is when children begin to speak, both language groups responded differently to experiments in which they were asked to compare and group actions such as the following:

Lucy for her research on the phenomenon of linguistic relativism chose as linguistic relativism the grammatical number, making inquiries in two genetically and typologically as different languages as Yucatec and English. In Spanish, there are many different ways to mark the grammatical category of number: Juan de Dios Luque Durán [3, p.49]

- 1) Morphological flexion (- s / - es)
- 2) Ordinal modifiers (first, second, tersero, etc.)
- 3) Cardinal modifiers (two, four, six, etc.)
- 4) Determinants (indeterminate article one (one), etc.)
- 5) Verbal concordance (suffix o, as / es, a / e of 3rd person of the present singular, pronominal forms me, te, se, nos, os, se)

There are some differences, as well as coincidences, in this respect with the Yucatecan:

- 1) In Yucatec, a plural suffix (-ó'ob) is commonly used for both nouns and pronouns and verb complements. As in many other languages of the world, this suffix is not mandatory and its use depends on the decision of the speaker depending on the existence or not of ambiguity [4, p.51].
- 2) In Yucatec, as in English, there is the possibility of using a modifier lexeme as a number marker, with the difference that in Yucatec said numeral modifier appears attached to a morpheme that works as a numeral classifier. This numeral classifier sets characteristics of nouns such as 'one/two / three dimensions', 'pair', 'part of a whole', etc. and sets types of measures. There are about one hundred different classifiers of this type in Yucatec. There is also a group of quantifiers that mark notions of the type 'few', 'other', etc.

However, the mechanisms of number marking in Yucatec are limited and are only used exhaustively with animated entities or with objects of the scope of possession of the same, so there is not the same importance or the same exhaustiveness when marking the number in English and in Yucatec. There is, in short, a kind of indifference when it comes to expressing the number in Yucatec when we compare it with other languages. From a point of view centered on linguistic relativism, the conclusion that can be reached is that English and Yucatecan, at least as far as the expression of plurality is concerned, construct the same reality in a different way. To corroborate this statement, Lucy used different drawings that represented different tasks; people working with different objects (trees, animals, constructions, etc.), different also in the number of elements that appeared [5, p.496].

According to the various theories presented in the processing of foreign languages, different models and teaching methods have been produced that have influenced, from different perspectives, in highlighting qualitative aspects that form the teaching-learning process.

Specialists stress that you cannot create a single method that is generally valid. In each of the teaching systems, there are positive and useful elements. At present, teaching-learning methods attempt to cover all aspects of the complex process of linguistic activity and foreign language learning.

The idea of an anthropocentric language can now be considered universally accepted: for many linguistic constructions, the representation of man acts as a natural reference point.

This scientific paradigm, which was formed at the turn of the Millennium, established new challenges in the study of language, requires new techniques to describe it, new approaches to analyze its units, categories and rules. The idea of anthropocentricity of language is key in modern linguistics. Today, the objective of linguistic analysis can no longer be considered simply the identification of the different characteristics of the linguistic system.

REFERENCES:

1. Blanco M. Actitudes lingüísticas en la primera mitad del siglo XIX en la Argentina. Cuadernos del Sur, 1985. pp. 131-149.
2. Blanco M. La lengua como conflicto: prescripción y estandarización en la historia del español de la Argentina. Políticas lingüísticas. Norma e identidad, 2001. pp. 99-110.
3. Censabella M. Las lenguas indígenas de la Argentina. Una mirada actual. 1999. 147 p.
4. Censabella M. La revitalización de las lenguas y la educación bilingüe intercultural. Actas del V encuentro de lenguas aborígenes y ex tranjeras, Universidad Nacional de Salta, 2005. pp. 56-78.
5. Duran JDL. Aspectos universales y particulares del léxico de las lenguas del mundo. Granada, 2001. pp. 496-498.