

Relativity, linguistic variation and language universals**Norova Barchinoy Qiyomiddin qizi**

4th year students at Djizzakh branch of The National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Farmonov Muhammad Qo'zi o'g'li

4th year students at Djizzakh branch of The National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Supervisor: **Abdurahmonova Zilola Yoqubjon qizi**

Assistant teacher in the department Foreign Languages at Djizzakh branch of The National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Annotation

Universal languages are often thought of as properties containing all languages. Due to the extreme structural diversity of languages, however, very few, if any, such universals exist. Rather, there are many typological universals that allow for variation but limit it or at least limit its distribution. This is true even among linguistic groups. Formal (grammatical or lexical categories) are not universal, but are restricted by the structure of conceptual space, as shown by a multidimensional scaling analysis of adpositional semantic data from Levinson et al. (2003). Despite this, broad conceptual categories are not universal. Rather, what is universal is the holistic description of highly specific situation types and the conceptual relationships that exist between them. This conclusion is confirmed by an analysis of results on the cross-linguistic variation in verbalization from Croft's.

Key words: coevolution; constituency; culture; dependency; evolutionary theory; linguistic diversity; linguistic typology; recursion; universal grammar; direct object; human capacity for language; universal properties; verb;

What is the relationship between language universals and linguistic variation?

The following quote from Geertz, which serves as the subject of an email I received from a colleague, is an example: ...the belief that the essence of what it means to be human is most clearly revealed in those aspects of human culture that are universal rather than in those that are unique to this group or that is a falsehood that we are not allowed to express. This quote may be taken to mean that there are two views on human culture universals, including universals of human language. The first is a form of "uniformitarianism," which Geertz refers to as "uniformitarianism," which we will describe as "output:" it is the belief that all cultures, including all languages, have certain distinct characteristics in common, and that these represent our common humanity. These are called unrestricted universals in linguistics, and they are the basis of what is termed "universal grammar" in Chomskyan linguistic theory. It is clear that he does not find such universals to be concrete or instructive in human nature when revisiting the Geertz paper. The variety of cultural traditions serves as an empirical refutation of extreme universalism. The diversity of human languages, as shown in literature and typology, stands as an empirical refutation of extreme universalism in linguistic theory.

What is the other option? The second point is one that could be called extreme relativism: each culture is unique (its "particularities") and even incommensurable with other cultures; our common humanity is to be found perhaps only in our individuality and cultural uniqueness. In modern anthropology, this position is widespread. But it is not the only argument, nor is it the one argued by Geertz: relativism is a real danger if one abandons uniformitarianism; it can only be defeated by seeing directly and fully the diversity of human experience...and embracing them within the body of one's conception of man, not by gliding past them with vague tautologies and forceless banalities.

Describe the following points: Variation and universals in a single language 46 when one designs an elicitation task such as Levinson et al.'s spatial pictures and asks more than one

speaker to describe the situation in the stimulus, different speakers will produce different utterances, with different words and expressions to describe the same stimulus. This isn't surprising at first glance. Levinson et al., 2002. This within-language variation has been idealized away from Levinson (2003) for their crosslinguistic MDS analysis (as we did also since we used their results). However, one should not do so. What does this within-language variation teach us about universals and relativity? Is it a dialectic model that was derived from typological data in the previous section? The answer is "yes." One must keep an eye on the verbalization process as much as possible in order to investigate within-language variation in situations. One can do this by creating similar situations and eliciting verbalizations of those situations from multiple speakers in a single language, not just across languages. The pear film (Chafe 1980), the Bowerman-Pederson spatial photographs discussed above, and the cutting/breaking videos (Majid et al., 1980) are just some of the examples. Majid and Bowerman, 2004, 2004, and 2007). To maximize comparability, the same depicted events are shown to different speakers in near-identical circumstances, and verbalizations are elicited from speakers in near-identical circumstances.

Conclusion. An analysis of variation between languages and within languages indicates that there is a place for universals of human thought and behavior, but not of the kind that is commonly discussed in debates on the subject. Extreme universalists advocated invariant (unrestricted) universals that do not eliminate all that is common to human beings. Focusing on those unrestricted universals that exist (if indeed there do) leaves out much of what is typical of human beings, particularly in terms of syntax and the conceptualization of experience inherent in language structures. Instead, variation is an essential component of human being; this is one of the insights shared by Geertz (see 1) and Greenberg. Greenberg and his successors were able to identify fundamental universals of language, typological universals that constrain variation. More recently, quantitative methods have enabled typologists to investigate the high degree of overlap in verbalization between speakers and across cultures, as well as the commonalities in overlap, such as variation in verbalization by speakers of the same language.

REFERENCES

1. Frost, Robert (1966) 'The figure a poem makes' in *Modern Poets on Modern Poetry*, ed. by James Scully, London: Fontana/Collins.
2. Abduraxmanova, Z., & Mamurova, M. (2021). THEORETICAL APPROACH TO SPEECH DISFLUENCIES IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETATION. In *МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ* (pp. 43-45).
3. Абдурахманова, З. (2022). Analysis of pauses and interruptions as elements of linguistic production in simultaneous interpretation. *Современные инновационные исследования актуальные проблемы и развитие тенденции: решения и перспективы*, 1(1), 533-535.
4. Zilola A., Barchinoy N., Muhammad F. THE ROLE OF MEDIA IN INFLUENCING CULTURE AND SOCIETY //Journal of Academic Research and Trends in Educational Sciences. – 2023. – T. 2. – №. 2. – С. 190-197.
5. Dildora Q., Barchinoy N., Muhammad F. AYTILGAN SINIF: FAOLI, SAMARALI VA MUSTAHKAMLANGAN O'QITISH-XAXSUS TO'LIQ O'G'ILGANLAR UCHUN //Journal of Academic Research and Trends in Educational Sciences. – 2023. – T. 2. – №. 2. – С. 358-364.
6. Zilola A. et al. ANALYSES OF ADS //International conference on multidisciplinary science. – 2023. – T. 1. – №. 5. – С. 66-69.
7. Zilola A. et al. ANALYSIS OF POEM // " XXI ASRDA INNOVATION TEXNOLOGIYALAR, FAN VA TA'LIM TARAQQIYOTIDAGI DOLZARB MUAMMOLAR" nomli respublika ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasi. – 2023. – T. 1. – №. 11. – С. 14-18.