



LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AND UNDERSTANDING OF AVIATION LANGUAGE AS TEXT OR AS A SYSTEM AS PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTICS

Kushakov Yusup Xaytbayevich, Tashkent State
Transport University

Annotation: *In this article, the main key points of Linguistics as the problem of linguistic diversity, understanding the language “as a text” or “as a system”, the role of quantitative methods and the role of diachronic analysis in language learning are revealed. The author highlights the key tendencies and problems in this sphere.*

Key words: *a point, diversity, linguistic diversity, connection, conceptual, disappearance, as text, as a system, diachronic, synchronic, changes.*

Аннотация: *В этой статье раскрываются основные ключевые моменты лингвистики как проблемы языкового разнообразия, понимания языка «как текста» или «как системы», роли количественных методов и роли диахронического анализа в изучении языка. Автор выделяет ключевые тенденции и проблемы в этой сфере.*

Ключевые слова: *точка, разнообразие, языковые разнообразия, связь, концептуальное, исчезновение, как текст, как система, диахронная, синхронная, изменения.*

Aviation English is the de facto international language of civil aviation. With the expansion of air travel in the 20th century, there were safety concerns about the ability of pilots and air traffic controllers to communicate. In 1951, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) recommended in "ICAO Annex 10 ICAO (Vol I, 5.2.1.1.2) to the International Chicago Convention" that English be universally used for "international aeronautical radiotelephony communications." [1] Despite being a recommendation only, ICAO aviation English was widely accepted. Aviation English is a type of English for specific purposes, with several specific

idiosyncratic structures: for example, any correction of a misspoken word must always be conveyed using the word "correction"

There are four key points where Linguistics is at a crossroads today. It is a problem of linguistic diversity, understanding the language "as text" or "as a system", the role of quantitative methods (and, more broadly, quantitative approaches) and the role of diachronic analysis in language learning. In the twentieth century, these questions were given some answers. Now - a few others, as is often the case in science. A certain vector is indicated, science is moving in this direction, but at some point it becomes clear that this way is exhausting itself.

The problem of linguistic diversity has two aspects. On the one hand, the importance of linguistic diversity is recognized by all, but in practice many linguists are still hostages of their native languages. For example, in order to describe the English language today, as the modern level of theoretical linguistics requires, it is necessary to know not only English itself and not only other Roman Germanic languages, We also need to know "neighboring" languages with which English entered into interaction and experienced their influence (like Turkic and Finno-Ugric). But generally speaking all other languages of mankind, including very different types languages need to be studied.

In Linguistics, as perhaps in no other science, there is a very close connection between the conceptual apparatus of the researcher and his native language or the languages he knows. This connection is neither in Chemistry, nor in Biology, nor even, for example, in History (if we take the humanitarian sphere). Perhaps partly similar problem exists in Philosophy too. But in Linguistics, this connection is unconditional. This problem was realized several centuries ago at the level of declaration. They wanted to overcome it all the time, but in the practical sphere has changed a little . In the twenty-first century we are witnessing the rapid disappearance of living languages. For us, as linguists the consequence of globalization is that our empirical material shrinks like shagreen leather. Moreover,

languages not only disappear (this applies to small languages, when the generation that spoke this language is leaving, and new generations are already choosing other, more common languages), but also experience enormous pressure of large number of world languages. Languages may not face immediate disappearance but they lose many of their original features. Borrowing, interference, tracing paper, structural convergence — these phenomena are well known to linguists, but their scale is constantly increasing, because our World is smaller and closer. The linguistic landscape is constantly changing. At present our task is not to miss the irreversible disappearance of linguistic diversity. The second problem is the understanding of the language "as a text" or "as a system". In the early twentieth century, Dr. Saussure canonized the idea of language as a system. He contrasted the language (an abstract system of rules) and speech (individual and specific cases of language use) [3, 31 273]. Now there is some redistribution of emphasis. Linguists pay more attention to the individual, random, variable — uses, discourse, specific speech practices of specific speakers. This is what Victor Markovich Zhivov once called in a well-known article (written together with A. Timberlake) parting with structuralism [2, 3 — 14]. In the twentieth century in general, system linguistics prevailed. It was a significant step forward in the science of language. But everything is relative, we can't stand still. And now we see the drawbacks of this approach. Saussure taught us that language is a system of rules - intangible, unobservable, inaccessible to the researcher directly. We have to reconstruct based on the texts. The text in this approach is something external, something that, so to speak, prevents us from getting to the object of study of an abstract language. As a result, we study the imaginary and discard the real, considering it random, variable, individual, etc. This is what is called speech. Of course, in the XX century there were attempts to study speech, to study the uses, but they were all marginal and not part of the mainstream. It seems that this situation is changing now. A number of influential approaches tell us that we need to shift from the study of the abstract system to the study of the only reality

that is available to us. Text is our only reality, and it is not always right and correct to reject it in favor of abstract language methodologically. We must return to the study of the text, to the study of random, variable, individual — all our fluid, unstructured, non-system reality. For assure, a larger value also has synchronic studies (review of the status of language as an established system at a particular point in time), not diachronic (the development of language over time). At present Linguistics is dominated by the opposite approach. Twenty-first-century linguistics is diachronic, not synchronic. It was one of the most important tenets of Dr. Saussure — synchronic is more important than diachronic. Now it is being revised: rather, diachronic is more important than synchronic, because language is constantly changing in time, this is one of its most essential properties. It is impossible to describe language, ignoring this its feature. Synchronic (as well as the system) is some abstraction, you can even say stronger — it is some illusion. We can only conditionally abstract from the ongoing processes of language change and assume that the language is stable for some period. But this is not always useful to do.

REFERENCES

1. Gasparov, B.M., 1996. Yazyk. Pamyat'. Obraz. Lingvistika yazykovogo sushchestvo-vaniya [Language. Memory. Image. Linguistics of language existence]. Moscow.
2. Zhivov, V. M., Timberleik, A., 1997. Parting with structuralism (theses for discussion). Voprosy yazykoznaniya [Issues of linguistics], 3.
3. Sossyu F. 1977. Course of general linguistics. Sossyur F Trudy po yazykoznaniyu [Proceedings on linguistics]. Moscow.
4. Bybee, J., 2007. Frequency of use and the organization of language. Cambridge.
5. Bybee, J., 2010. Language, Usage and Cognition. Cambridge.
6. Hopper, P. J., 2012. Emergent grammar. In: J. P. Gee and M. Handford, The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis. London.

7. Brophy, J. (2006). History of Research on Classroom Management. In C.M. Evertson & C.S. Weinstein (Eds.), Handbook of classroom management. Research, practice, and contemporary issues (pp. 17–43). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
8. Marzano, R.J., Marzano, J.S., & Pickering, D.J. (2003). Classroom management that works. Research-based strategies for every teacher. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
9. Scrivener J. Learning Teaching: The Essential Guide to English Language Teaching 3rd edition. – MacMillan, 2011.