

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)
International Scientific Journal
Theoretical & Applied Science
p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)
Year: 2020 Issue: 04 Volume: 84
Published: 30.04.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Mukhtorali Turdaliyevich Zokirov
Ferghana State University
Associate professor, Candidate of Philological Sciences
mukhtar63@mail.ru

Shirin Shuhratovna Dadabayeva
Ferghana State University
assistant lecturer
mukhtar63@mail.ru


ABOUT THE ROLE OF LANGUAGES CONTACTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGES

Abstract: This article discusses the role and place of language contacts in the development of languages. In this regard, linguistic phenomena such as bilingualism and linguistic interference, which are part of the theory of linguistic contacts, are also highlighted. It is emphasized that the study of language contacts and their results can contribute to the study of the features of the structure of the language system itself.

Key words: language contacts, convergent development, divergent development, linguistic factor, morphological system, phonological system, monolingual, bilingual, bilingualism, mixed bilingualism, unmixed bilingualism, creolized language, pidgin, language interference, lexical borrowing, syntax, morphology.

Language: English

Citation: Zokirov, M. T., & Dadabayeva, S. S. (2020). About the role of languages contacts in the development of languages. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (84), 687-691.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-84-118> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.118>
Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

It is known that contacts of languages are one of the most important external factors in the historical development of languages in modern linguistics. Science virtually unknown languages, the development of which would flow in isolation from external influences: this circumstance allows to say that in some very general sense, all languages can be described as “mixed languages” [2, 362-372]. Linguistics contacts lead to convergent and divergent development of language interaction. In this regard, in some areas of linguistics, it is the contacts even saw the decisive stimulus for the development of the language system [1, 8-11]. The importance of studying language contacts and their results is because it can shed light on the features of the very structure of the language system.

The main part

Language contacts are a complex and multi-stage process, closely related to the development of society. They suggest the existence of several other - cultural, economic, and so on contacts, including ethnic ones. Even the activity or inactivity of a party involved in the contact is determined by extralinguistic factors - cultural or social authority of speakers of a language, of attributes of its functional importance.

Causes of language change first, occurring in the process of language contact, lie not so much in the structure of the interacting languages as abroad. On the other hand, one can not doubt that each such Conversion of vanie is a consequence of the interaction of a whole set of reasons. For quite some results (for example, to a general simplification of the morphological system, to the tendency to analytic and so on) result in the very fact of language contact, to a tory objective aims to eliminate idiomatic of each of the interacting structures. It is well known that

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

changes in the phonological and, in part, morphological systems of the language are in a certain dependence on the corresponding changes in vocabulary. However, it should be borne in mind and numerous structural "factors" of language that facilitate or hinder this or that particular change. So, the fairly obvious fact that other things being equal, the most prone to this kind of language transformation in contact with closely related language, characterized by a large structural and material similarity. It is noted that the vocabulary of a foreign language easier to have assimilated by languages with a predominance non-articulate synchronous point of view of words and harder - languages to actively functioning ways compounding and derivation [13]. On the other hand, the inclusion in the new token is stimulated and such internal "factors", such as a) low frequency of use of the corresponding native words, making them unstable, b) the presence of unfavorable synonymy, c) the need for expressive synonyms and euphemisms and so on [1, 52-53]. It is the structural parameters of the language due to sharply different relationships of languages to syntactic borrowings. The presence in the phonological system of the language of the so-called "empty cells" contributes to the enrichment of its phonemic inventory both due to intrastructural transformations and through acquired material. Said, apparently enough to come to the general conclusion that "only when the study of the internal factors can answer the question why some outside of exposure impact on the language, while others - not" [5, 303].

One of the basic concepts of the theory of language contact is the concept of bilingualism, whereby the study of bilingualism is often recognized as even the main task of contact studies. It is in bilingual groups of speakers that one language system comes into contact with another and for the first time contact-related deviations from the language norm occur, which are called hereafter W.Weinreich interference [1, 32-39]. and which subsequently go beyond bilingual groups [3].

Bilingual persons are usually understood as native speakers of a certain language A, switching to language B when communicating with native speakers of the latter (moreover, most often one of these languages turns out to be their native language, and the other acquired). It should be noted that a lively discussion in the last question of the degree of ownership of speaking a second language (active, passive, and so on.). It should be noted at the same time that the question of the degree of speaking a second language (activity, passivity, etc.), which was animatedly discussed in the past, with "genuine" bilingualism can hardly be considered important, not only because in conditions of language contact it is only about collective bilingualism, but also since the only consequence of insufficient knowledge of the second language can be its incomplete assimilation, as is the case in the so-called "creolized" languages.

Moreover, the circumstance does not matter whether this fact of bilingualism is characterized by the use of a second language with a functionally unlimited scope or the use of one or another auxiliary language such as pidgin. On the contrary, it is the appropriate demarcation of the two different types of bilingualism - unmixed and mixed. With unmixed bilingualism, the acquisition of a second language occurs during the learning process, during which the learner is informed of the rules for establishing correspondences between the elements of the mother tongue and the language being studied and a rational system for fixing these correspondences in memory is provided. With it, linguistic interference gradually weakens over time, giving way to the correct switching from one language to another in the goma. In the case of "mixed bilingualism" (the term of L. V. Shcherba), established in the process of self-learning, both languages are forming in the speaker's mind only one system of categories in such a way that any element of the language then has its direct equivalent in another language. In this case, language interference progresses, capturing ever wider layers of the language and leading to the formation of a language with one plan of content and two planes of expression, qualified by L.V.Shcherba as a "mixed language with two terms" (langue mixte a Deux termes). It should be noted that unmixed bilingualism is characteristic of language contacts occurring in conditions of a high level of education and culture [12, 59-65; 17, 47-52; 7, 261-264].

From what has been said, it should follow that for an adequate understanding of the mechanism of language change in bilingualism, the description of the contact process in the form of learning models with a focus on the "learner" is of great importance, since at least one of the contacting parties teaches the other to understand the language and speak it [1, 20-26; 11, 124-126].

In the history of languages, it is fundamentally important to distinguish between two different consequences of language contacts - the borrowing of individual language elements (the assimilation of more or fewer substantive or structural characteristics) in the broadest sense of the word, on the one hand, and the change of language as a whole, on the other. It should be borne in mind that both phenomena correspond not so much to a different degree of intensity of language contact, but to different social or political conditions in which this contact is made. At the same time, a change of language occurs in different ways: in one case, it leads to a more or less complete assimilation of the language and, consequently, to language assimilation of the corresponding bilingual groups, and in others to its incomplete assimilation, which results in the emergence of the so-called "Pidgin" and creolized languages. Given the structural homogeneity of these languages, characterized by the so-called "optimal"

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

grammatical structure, which transfers the center of gravity to the syntactic ways of expressing grammatical meanings (they do not, for example, contain such excessive features of European languages as gender, number, case of pronouns, complex verb forms, etc.), and substantially reduced vocabulary inventory, Creolized languages differ from Pidgin only in their area of functioning, since they are the native languages of certain ethnic groups in the West Indies, West Africa, to the islands of the Indian and Pacific oceans, while pidgins only play the role of auxiliary languages with a very limited sphere of operation (the latter feature characterizes the artificial auxiliary languages such as Esperanto and Ido). In most cases, these languages owe their formation to the conditions of unequal social or economic relations between speakers of contacting languages. It should be noted that modern specialized literature emphasizes not a mixed, but one-sided - in almost all cases Indo-European - affiliation of the languages in question (noteworthy is the high level of their lexical homogeneity) [3, 374-379].

The most subject to contact changes in the language system, as you know, is vocabulary. If we bear in mind that it is lexical borrowings that mediate most of the other contact-related changes - phonological and morphological (the exception is syntactic), then it is easy to see what far-reaching consequences for the structure of the language they can lead. According to the degree of phonetic and functional adaptations occurring, however, are not always parallel, lexical borrowing can be divided into developed and undeveloped. The predominant sphere of lexical borrowings in the language, of course, is the more or less peripheral categories of vocabulary, for example, industry terminology, proper names, etc. However, in cases of more or less intense external pressure, the so-called "main" vocabulary of the language becomes open for contact penetration. In particularly favorable conditions of contact, the percentage of acquired vocabulary, especially for some styles of language, can be very high. It is noted, for example, that medieval Turkish and Persian literary languages accounted for up to 80% of Arabisms, Korean - up to 75% of Sinism. It is known that the abundance of Iranian strata of different eras in the Armenian dictionary for a long time even prevented an adequate determination of the place of the Armenian language among the Indo-European. Such a high degree of permeability of the lexical structure of the language contains an indication of its most open - compared to other levels of the structure - character so that the inclusion of a new term in it leads to minimal disturbance of existing system relations.

Lexical inclusion necessarily lead to the development of language synonyms (though usually - incomplete), to changes in the semantics of native words (for example, in the United States under the

influence of the semantics of English. To Introduce, port. Introduzir, it. Introdurre and French Introduire purchased additional meaning 'introduce, represent'). On the other hand, as G. Paul saw, it is through massive cases of assimilation of lexemes of the same structure that individual word-building affixes are borrowed [9, 469]. Thus, in the Uzbek language acquired and productivity derivational affixoids - *xona, noma, -goh: bosmaxona, yotoqxon, ishxona, bildirishnoma, yilnoma, yo 'riqnoma*, which have been carved out of a mass of words of Persian-Tajik origin *guvohnoma, dorinoma, solnoma, farmonnoma, boloxona, garovxon, kabobxon, mehmonxon, go 'laxxon, darvozaxon* [8, 56]. Similarly, the number of phraseological changes turns out to be quite high in languages: the vast majority of them are represented by tracing papers, although cases of direct assimilation of expressions from closely related languages are well known (cf. Old Slavonic phraseological units in Russian).

In the grammatical structure of the language in this respect, two essentially different sides are distinguished - morphology and syntax. If the first of them, as it is constantly emphasized, is characterized by a very high degree of impermeability, then the second in many cases is very susceptible to external influences. Indeed, the most obvious result of any kind of close linguistic contact is not enrichment, but rather a simplification of morphology, which in its most striking form characterizes creolized languages and pidgin. In such cases, the morphological methods of expressing meanings, as a rule, are replaced in the resulting language system by lexical and syntactic ones, as a result of which the composition of morphological categories is drastically impoverished. As V.Yu. Rosenzweig notes, convincing confirmation of this kind of exclusion of "idiomatic" categories (that is, absent in one of the contacting languages) of the categories was obtained by I. A. Melchuk in his work on the construction of an intermediary language for machine translation: according to the latter in the intermediary language, there must be means of expressing all the meanings involved in the translation of languages, and there should be no meanings required only for one of them (the latter turn into lexical ones) [12, 66].

Even though at present linguists are much less absolute in their negative opinion regarding the permeability of linguistic morphology, the thesis on the exclusivity of borrowing inflectional forms remains valid [10, 496; 14, 208]. Most often we are only talking about the assimilation of individual morphological indicators (new cash allomorphs in the morpheme language), that is, substances, and not the structural units themselves [16], for example, the spread of the Arabic, the so-called "broken" plural in Tajik, Uzbek and some other languages of the Middle East and Central Asia. Reliable cases when, as a result

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

of linguistic interference, and acquisitions in the morphological structure occur, are hardly known.

The syntax is different, which in languages with a relatively free word order in a sentence can actively rebuild under the pressure of an adjacent language system. To illustrate the possible flexibility of the syntax of such languages, it is enough to indicate, for example, far-reaching correspondences in the sentence structure in many languages of ancient translations of the biblical text. At the same time, in those languages in which the main burden of transmitting grammatical meanings lies with the syntax, syntactic borrowings are limited to the peripheral part of the system.

Despite the somewhat exaggerated understanding of the role of linguistic contacts in the historical development of the phonological system of language, facts illustrating this role are far from rare as is the case in the field of morphology. For a course, it is quite obvious that in the most general case of contact interaction of language includes vocabulary phonetically is accommodated according to certain rules of substitution sound types to the specifics of the phonological system learns the language. However, in conditions of more intense contact, accompanied by the inclusion of a more or less significant layer of phonetically non-accommodating material, shifts occur in the phonological system of the borrowing language both at the level of substance and at the level of the structure itself. Since the use of the phoneme acquired for a particular language in the speech of the bilingual part of its speakers is not indicative, since it can be explained by the incorporation of elements of the second language system, the criterion on which to judge whether the phoneme is already borrowed in this language or not should be considered the fact of its appearance in the speech of monolinguals (but regardless of whether its use has penetrated the original material of the language) [4, 169-170]. An example of contact-related changes of the first kind, when the anthropophonic side is affected, can serve as the transformation of the entire so-called "tense" series of canthic and affricates into couscous in some Armenian dialects, as well as the phonological system of the Romanian language, subjected to such a strong Slavic influence, the Romanian language could be considered as romance with Slavic pronunciation.

Structurally, language contacts sometimes turn out to be a decisive factor in the phonologization of allophones already existing in a given phonological system, especially when there are so-called "empty cells" in the system (cf. phonological *f* in Russian, accent *g* in Czech, vowels *e* and *o* in Quechua) or in the inclusion in the inventory of a new phoneme. Such inclusion at first captures very limited layers of the

dictionary. So, for example, in the Ossetian language, originally phyto-laryngeal consonants that are alien to the system characterize mainly substrate and expressive vocabulary. It should be noted at the same time that sound types assimilated from other languages often have an unstable or, in any case, insufficiently clear phonological status. Thus, the phoneme "Ain," which occurs in Persian exclusively in words of Arabic origin, characterizes only some styles of the language, descending into the rest. On the other hand, a sound type of Arabic origin *q*, transmitted in the letter "qaf", in Persian only has the status of an allophone of phoneme *g* (at present about 60% of words containing *q* are Arabicisms or Arabized Iranian words) [6, 35-37]. The most noticeable changes occur in the phonological system of the language, which appears under conditions of intense and prolonged contact exposure.

Conclusion

The above considerations allow us to draw some more or less certain conclusions. First of all, the formation of new language units as a result of the mixing of others can be traced with sufficient reliability only at the level of dialects that have not reached the so-called integration threshold. The integration threshold is understood as a combination of linguistic features that impede linguistic confusion. For example, although in certain territories the Russian language is in contact with related languages such as Polish or Lithuanian, there is still no formation of mixed Polish-Russian or Lithuanian-Russian dialects. This means that the above-related languages have reached the threshold of integration, eliminating the present their mixing.

Languages are deformed in a certain way under the influence of other languages but do not mix. In this case, different levels of the language react differently. One can speak of confusion in the true sense of the word only in the field of vocabulary. In the area of the sound system, one can observe the assimilation of some articulations alien to a given language, but not the mixing of the two systems. Systems of inflectional elements, as a rule, rarely mix. Therefore, there can be no talk of confusion. Language can perceive only individual typological models. The assimilation of typological and model models is also characteristic of syntax, although in this area borrowing of some elements of communication, for example, unions, can be observed. Individual word-building elements may be borrowed. Besides, as mentioned above, a foreign language influence can be manifested like stress, the meaning of grammatical forms, it can to a certain extent guide language development, etc.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHII (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

References:

1. Berdaliev, A., & Zokirov, M.T. (2018). *O'zbek va tojik lisoniy aloqasi asoslari*. Farg'ona.
2. Boduen de Kurtene, I.A. (1963). *Izbrannye trudy po obshcheyu yazykoznaniyu*, t. I - II. Moscow.
3. Vaynrayh, U. (1979). *Yazykovye kontakty*. (p.260). Kiev.
4. Vereshchagin, E.M. (1968). *O probleme zaimstvovaniya fonem*, V sb.: «Yazyk i obshchestvo». Moscow.
5. Gavranek, B. (1972). K probleme smesheniya yazykov. *Novoe v lingvistike: vyp.6.-M.*, pp.94-111.
6. Giunashvili, J.Sh. (1965). *Sistema fonem persidskogo yazyka*, «Trudy TGU», t. 116. Tbilisi.
7. Zokirov, M.T. (2019). Bilingvizm xodisasining umumiy tavsifi hususida. *NamDU ilmiy ahborotnomasi-Nauchnyy vestnik NamGU*, №10, 261-264.
8. Zokirov, M.T. (2016). O'zbek va tojik tillarining leksik sathdagi o'zaro ta'siri hususida. *FarDU. Ilmiy habarlar - Nauchnyy vestnik. FerGU*, №1, p.56.
9. Paul, G. (1960). *Prinsipy istorii yazyka*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo inostrannoy literatury.
10. Reformatskiy, A.A. (2004). *Vvedenie v yazykovedenie*. Moscow: Aspekt Press.
11. Rozensveyg, V.Yu. (1967). «Vliyaniye» ili «mehanizm kontaktov», V sb.: «Problemy yazykoznaniya». Moscow.
12. Rozensveyg, V.Yu. (1972). *Yazykovye kontakty*. (p.80). L.: Nauka.
13. Sepir, E. (1993). *Yazyk*, V kn.: *Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniyu i kulturologii*. (pp.223-247). Moscow.
14. Serebrennikov, B.A. (1952). *Ob ustoychivosti morfologicheskoy sistemy yazyka*, - V sb.: «Voprosy teorii i istorii yazyka». Moscow.
15. Haugen, E. (1972). YAzykovoy kontakt. *Novoe v lingvistike: vyp.6.-M.*, pp.61-80.
16. Shchuhardt, G. (2010). *Izbrannye stat'i po yazykoznaniyu*. (p.296). Moscow.
17. Shcherba, L.V. (1974). *O ponyatii smesheniya yazyka*, V kn.: L. V. Shcherba. *Yazykovaya sistema i rechevaya deyatelnost*. (pp.60-74). L..
18. Yakobson, R.O. (1985). *Izbrannye raboty*. (p.460). Moscow: Progress.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350
