

работают в рамках совместной учебной деятельности, достигают более высоких результатов, чем те, кто работает в рамках конкурентных и индивидуализированных структур обучения. Другие результаты совместного обучения показывают, что сотрудничество положительно влияет на отношения учащихся, их самооценку, долговременную память или более глубокое понимание материала урока. Он был протестирован как одна из самых эффективных и конструктивных стратегий обучения.

В статье исследуется метод совместного обучения, его преимущества и наиболее частые задачи для его применения. При написании статьи использовались лингвистические методы и методы наблюдения.

Rəyçi: f.ü.f.d. Kəmalə Əliyeva

Praktik xarici dillər kafedrasının 15 oktyabr 2021-ci il tarixli iclasın 02 sayılı protokolu

Daxil olma tarixi 17 oktyabr 2021-ci il

UOT:811

DEVELOPMENT OF LINGUISTIC THEORY

Əhmədova Vüsalə Zirəddin qızı

Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti

axmedovavz@mail.ru

Annotation: *A word based grammar involves three main procedures: the identification of the word as an isolable linguistic entity, the establishment of a set of word classes to distinguish and classify the words in the language, and the working out of adequate grammatical categories to describe and analyze the morphology of words entering into paradigms of associated forms and the syntactic relations obtaining between words in the construction of sentences.*

The framework of grammatical description in western antiquity was the word and paradigm model. Despite the richness of classical morphology, a theory of the morpheme was not achieved, and classical grammatical statements exhibit the strengths and the weakness of a word-based morphology.

Logically one might argue that in working out a word-based grammar one should proceed first with the formal identification of the word unit, then with the classes of words, and finally with the categories relevant to them. This, in fact, is the order of treatment in Dionysius Thrax's Greek grammar. Historically, however, we find what were later to be part of the system of grammatical categories discussed first, sporadically by the fifth-century Sophists. Protagoras considered the nominal category of gender in Greek, and is reported to have wished menis, anger, and pelex, helmet, to be masculine instead of feminine, presumably on the grounds of a semantic association with male characteristics and activities rather than with female. Socrates may himself have discussed this category, as Aristophanes makes fun of him in his comedy The Clouds for suggesting new formally feminine words like alektryaina, hen, instead of the use of alektryon in both the masculine and feminine genders for 'cock' and 'hen', and for worrying about words like kardopos, trough, one of the few second declension nouns ending in -os that were feminine.

The first phase focuses on spoken language as the main aid for writing development, and the development then takes its course reaching the fourth phase, which continues beyond formal education.

Acar sözlər: lüğət, inkişaf, ifadə, tərcümə.

Ключевые слова: словарь, развитие, выражение, перевод.

Key words: dictionary, development, derivation, translation.

Historically the importance of the controversy is due to its place in the early development of linguistic theory and to the stimulus it provided to more detailed examination of the Greek language. In maintaining and in criticizing each side of the argument people were led to examine more closely the structures and the meanings of words and the formal patterns that words exhibited. In such examinations lies the beginning of precise linguistic analysis.

Later scholars took up more definite positions than we find in Plato. Aristotle firmly adopted a conventionalist point of view: 'Language is by convention, since no names arise naturally. Onomatopoeia need not invalidate this, since onomatopoeic forms vary from language to language and are always cast within the phonology of the particular language. Aristotle's view of language is summed up at the beginning of the *De interpretatione*: 'Speech is the representation of the experiences of the mind, and writing is the representation of speech.'

Epicurus (341-270) took up a middle position, holding that word forms arose naturally but were modified by convention. More importantly in the history of linguistics, the Stoics favored the natural status of language, again relying heavily on onomatopoeia and sound symbolism: 'In the opinion of the Stoics names are naturally formed, the first sounds imitating the things which they name. This attitude fitted well with their more general emphasis on nature as the guide to man's proper life; and in their etymology much weight was placed on the 'original forms' or 'first sounds' of words, *potichomania*, which were said to have been onomatopoeic but later to have suffered changes of various kinds.

These opposing views of Aristotle and the Stoics are important since they lead to the second linguistic controversy of antiquity, analogy versus anomaly. This was not set out formally, with the opposing arguments marshaled against each other, before the extended treatment accorded to the question by the first-century B.C. Latin writer Varro; and one must not envisage the two views as the exclusive tenets of permanent opponents locked in continuous conflict, but rather as two attitudes to language, each in itself reasonably justified by part of the evidence and each favored by some individuals and groups.

It seems clear that Aristotle favored analogy and the Stoics favored anomaly as the dominant theme in language. Later analogists tended to concentrate on linguistic questions for the purposes of literary criticism and the maintenance of standards of correctness; Stoic interests were more broadly based. The division may have been sharpened by the rivalry of Alexandria and Pergamum under Macedonian rule as two main centers of learning, Alexandria dominated by analogists Pergamum by Stoics. Chrysopsius, the Stoic, wrote a treatise on linguistic anomaly. Once more it may be felt that the controversy was expressed in terms that one would not resort to today; but, like the nature-convention argument, it was part of the context within which the detailed investigation of Greek and Latin grammar took place, and a lack of historical sympathy is perhaps shown by those who would dismiss it, as Classen did, as not worth so much as a yawn.

Broadly, the controversy turned on the extent to which orderliness and especially proportional regularity held sway in the Greek language, and by implication in language as a whole, and to what extent irregularities, 'anomalies', characterized it. These sorts of analogies lie at the heart of morphology, and without them paradigms of different word classes, and their subclasses (declensions and conjugations in Latin and Greek), in which repetitive patterns are summarized, would not be discoverable. They are moreover the basis of any attempted semantic labeling of grammatical categories such as singular and plural and the nominal cases. To this extent, as the later grammarian Dionysius Thorax pointed out, the morphological component of grammar largely consists of 'the working out of analogy'.

While it may now be seen that the entire basis of an economical description of Greek morphology rested on the recognition and systematization of formal analogies, the

anomalisms had no lack of counter examples with which to maintain their thesis. Most nominal and verbal paradigmatic classes admit exceptions, irregular members, which cannot be expurgated from the languages at the behest of grammarians. In a genial attack on grammarians as a class, makes much of the semantic anomalies of gender, pointing not only to the masculine and feminine genders of nouns denoting in-animate and abstractions and the use of a single masculine or feminine (and sometimes a neuter) noun to refer to both sexes of an animate, but also to dialectal variation between the genders of some nouns.

The anomalism case appeared at first more cogent when no adequate distinction was made between inflection and derivation within grammatical word form variations. It is a characteristic of Greek and indeed of most languages that the inflexional paradigms are much more regular and apply to entire classes of stems, whereas the incidence of derivational formations is more irregular. Almost all Greek nouns had forms for five cases, singular and plural, but derivational suffixes were restricted to specific noun stems; thus, we find *pater*, father, and *patrios*, paternal, but no corresponding form *matron* with *meter*, mother. Likewise, English derives nouns from adjectives by such varied formations as *true*, truth, *happy*, happiness, *hot*, heat, *high*, height, and *possible*, possibility, and some speakers would hesitate between *suitableness* and *suitability*.

In rejecting an equation of one word, one meaning, the Stoic anomalisms showed an important insight into the semantic structure of language: word meaning do not exist in isolation, and they may differ according to the collocation in which they are used. Augustine, setting out Stoic views, points to the different meanings of Latin *acies* when collocated with *militia*(soldiers), *line of battle*, *ferry(sword)*, *sharp edge of the blade*, and *coulomb* (eyes), keenness of vision.

The consonance of the analogical attitude to language with Aristotle's general philosophical position is not hard to illustrate. Proportionality appears in several places in his works as a guiding principle in conduct and in reasoning. It was moreover logically associated with the conventionalist view of language, which he espoused, since the more regularity there is to be found in any arbitrary, conventional system of communication, the more efficient it will be.

The Stoics, however, regarded language as a natural human capability to be accepted as it was, with all its characteristic irregularity. They took a broader view of what was good Greek than the analogists, and were interested in linguistic questions not principally as grammatical and textual critics; they were philosophers for whom language served as the expression of thought and feeling and for whom literature held deeper meanings and insights veiled in myth and allegory, (the Greek word *allegorical*, *allegorically*, is first known to have been used by the Stoic Cleanthes).

The three main aspects of linguistic study that received specific attention among early Greek scholars were etymology, phonetics (pronunciation), and grammar. In the first, despite a lot of enthusiasm, little of value was achieved; interest in etymological research was stimulated by the nature-convention controversy over the origin of language, but a proper conception of linguistic change and the factors involved in it largely escaped the western world in ancient times. From the start etymological investigation was directed towards attempts at tracing the forms of words back to the forms of other words by which the meaning of the former could, it was thought, be explained. Similar efforts continued to characterize etymological scholarship throughout antiquity and the middle Ages. It is a pity that failure in this field is better known than the undoubted and important success elsewhere achieved, particularly in grammar, and that the level of the ancient world's etymological work has sometimes been quite unjustly taken to be typical of Greco-Roman linguistics as a whole.

More progress was made in phonetics. Some articulator classifications were attempted, the syllable was introduced as a structural unit of phonological description, and by the time of

the Stoics a rudimentary picture was grasped of speech as the effect of articulator interference with regressive air from the lungs. Only Greek was studied. Foreign words were written as best they could be with the Greek letters, but no scholarly concern was evinced over alien sounds or alien sound systems. The descriptive framework for Greek phonetics was the Greek alphabet, and statements took the form of accounts of the pronunciation of the letters in it.

One objection to such a letter-based approach to phonetics is that the recognition of allophonic differences within the Greek phonemes was obstructed; commentators refer to different conjoint realizations of vowels with different accents and with and without aspiration and length; but they make no mention of different qualities of vowel sounds themselves though such differences must have accompanied different segmental and suprasegmental environments. Nor were the phonetic differences between the dialects described except those differences that were represented by different spellings. This fallacy was not challenged, and it appears explicitly in Priscian at the end of the classical period, writing on Latin: 'Just as atoms come together and produce every corporeal thing, so likewise do speech sounds compose articulate speech as it were some bodily entity'.

Though three are general grammatical arguments in favor of treating syntactic relations as the central component of grammar (they are, for example, dealt with in earlier rules than those covering word morphology in a generative grammar), in the history of western grammatical theory morphology appears to have been formalized first; our first extant description of Greek morphology antedates our first extant description of Greek syntax by two centuries, and the latter is based on the former in its statements.

Bibliography

1. Bailey CJ (1981). "[Developmental linguistics](#)". *Folia Linguistica*. 15 (1–2): 29–38. doi:[10.1515/flin.1981.15.1-2.29](#).
2. Chomsky, Noam (1995). "[Language and Nature](#)". *Mind*. 104 (413): 1–61. doi:[10.1093/mind/104.413.1](#).
3. McLaughlin, S. F. (2010). "[Verbal behavior by B.F. Skinner: Contributions to analyzing early language learning](#)". *The Journal of Speech and Language Pathology – Applied Behavior Analysis*. 5 (2): 114–131. doi:[10.1037/h0100272](#). Retrieved 11 May 2019.
4. Singleton D (2005). "[The Critical Period Hypothesis: A coat of many colours](#)". *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. 43 (4): 269–285. doi:[10.1515/iral.2005.43.4.269](#)

DİL NƏZƏRİYYƏSİNİN İNKİŞAFI

Əhmədova Vüsalə Zirəddin qızı

Xülasə

Tarixən mübahisələrin əhəmiyyəti onun dil nəzəriyyəsinin erkən inkişafındakı yerindən və dilin daha müfəssəl araşdırılması üçün verdiyi stimuldan qaynaqlanır. Mübahisəni hər tərəfini qoruyaraq və araşdıraraq insanlar sözlərin quruluşlarını və mənalarını, nümayiş olunan rəsmi nümunələri daha yaxından araşdırmağa başladılar. Belə müayinələrdə dəqiq dil təhlili başlanğıcı oldu.

Dil nəzəriyyəsinin inkişafı dedikdə dilçiliyi fərddə dil qabiliyyətinin inkişafını, xüsusən uşaqlıqda dil anlamını, mənimsəməni öyrənməkdir. Bu, ikitərəfli sahəyə əlavə olaraq, həm ilk, həm də ikinci dildə dilin öyrənilməsi, dilin tutulması və dil itkisinin müxtəlif mərhələləri üzərində aparılan tədqiqatları əhatə edir. Körpələr danışa bilməzdən əvvəl beynindəki neyron dövrənlər daim dilə məruz qalmaqla təsirlənir. İnkişaf dilçiliyi, linqvistik təhlilin digər yanaşmalarda deyildiyi kimi zamansız olmadığını, zamana həssas və müstəqil olmadığını - sosial-kommunikativ, eləcə də bio-nevroloji aspektləri linqvistik səbəblərin müəyyən edilməsində nəzərə alınması fikrini dəstəkləyir.

РАЗВИТИЕ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОЙ ТЕОРИИ

Əhmədova Vüsala Zirəddin qızı

Резюме

Историческая важность дебатов истекает из раннего развития теории языка и стимула, который она обеспечивает для более тщательного изучения языка. Защищая и исследуя каждый аспект дискуссии, люди начали внимательно изучать структуру и значение слов на примерах, которые были представлены. Такие примеры стали началом точного анализа языка.

Развитие теории языка заключается в том, что лингвистика включает в себя развитие языковых навыков человека, особенно овладение языком. Прежде чем ребенок сможет говорить, язык мозга всегда влияет на нервные системы. Развития лингвистики поддерживает мнение о том, что лингвистический анализ не является вневременным, как в других подходах, и не чувствителен ко времени и независимым - принимая во внимание лингвистические причины социальных и коммуникативных подходов, а также био-неврологических аспектов.

Rəyçi: dos. Sevdə Kazımova

Leksika və ölkəşünaslıq kafedrasının 14 aprel 2021-ci iltarixli iclasın 08 sayılı protokolu

Daxil olma tarixi 21 may 2021-ci il

UOT:94.(479.24).

ŞIRVANIN I PYOTRUN XARİCİ SİYASƏTİNDƏ

(rus arxiv sənədləri əsasında)

Əliyev Mübariz Müseyib oğlu

Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti

Xülasə: *Şirvan I Pyotrun şərq siyasətində ümdə yerlərdən birini tuturdu. Təsadufi deyildir ki, Rusyanın hakim dairələrində I Pyotrun tarixi ədəbiyyatda “İran yürüşü” kimi məşhur olan əməliyyatı əvvəllər rəsmi sənədlərdə “Şamaxı ekspedisiyası” adlandırılırdı.*

Lakin Şirvanda baş verən üsyan, Şamaxının Hacı Davud tərəfindən alınması və Türkiyənin Hacı Davudun hərəkətlərinə rəğbət bəsləməsi I Pyotru yürüşə başlamağa tələsdirdi.

Açar sözlər -Qiyamçı yürüşü, müttəfiq,qoşun, siyasət

Ключевые слова- Сопротивление, союзники, войска, политика

Key words -Resistance rally, allies, troops, politics

I Pyotrun Azərbaycana yürüşünə Qərbi Avropa diplomatlarının Rusyadakı səfirlərinin fikirlərinə biganə yanaşmaq olmaz. Bu barədə Fransanın Peterburuqdakı səfiri de Kampredonun mərkəzə verdiyi məlumat Şirvan üsyanın tarixini öyrənmək baxımından maraqlıdır. O, yazırdı ki, “Şamaxının qarət etmiş qiyamçılar hazırda Türkiyənin himayəsi altına keçməyə çalışaçaqlar.” Çar /I Pyort nə. / hec cür razı olmaz ki, Türkiyə onları öz himayəsi altına alsın və bu bütün dövlətlərin mənafeyinə ziddir. Çünki , belə olduqda Türkiyə Xəzər dənizində bütün ticarəti öz əlinə ala bilərdi. Onun başqa bir məktubunda I Pyortun yüksək keyfiyyətli xam ipək mənbələrini ələ keçirmək istəməsindən bəhs olunur.Belə olduqda ipək ticarəti Rusyanın inhisarına keçəcək və həm də Rusyanın cənub sərhədləri xeyli möhkəmlənəcək.(1)