ETHIOPIAN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

eISSN: 2349-5715 pISSN: 2349-5707

Volume: 12, Issue 04, April-2025 SJIF 2019: 4.702 2020: 4.737 2021: 5.071 2022: 4.919 2023: 6.980 2024: 7,662

LINGUISTIC RESEARCH METHODS IN COMPARATIVE STUDY

Masharipova Adolat Odilbekovna
Assistant teacher, Urgench state pedagogical institute
adolatmasharipova1404@gmail.com
Asadov Rustam Muminovich
PhD, associate professor, Samarkand state institute of foreign languages
rustamasadov1972@gmail.com

Abstract: The comparative study of languages provides invaluable insights into linguistic structures, cultural influences, and historical relationships. This thesis explores the principal linguistic research methods used in comparative studies, including descriptive, comparative-historical, structural, typological, and experimental methodologies. Each method's theoretical underpinnings, application, and significance in linguistic research are examined, with examples of practical application and a critical evaluation of their effectiveness. Future research directions emphasize integrating computational and corpus-based approaches with traditional methods to enrich comparative linguistics further.

Key words:comparative-historical method, phonological patterns, syntactic parsing, dependency parsing, typological comparison, proto-language reconstruction, lexical activation, psycholinguistic approaches, neurolinguistic data

Introduction

Language is a cornerstone of human civilization, reflecting intricate cognitive, cultural, and historical dimensions. Comparative linguistics seeks to identify patterns, similarities, and differences across linguistic systems, uncovering relationships among languages. This field requires a multidisciplinary approach, leveraging various research methodologies that facilitate linguistic feature analysis and reveal relationships.

This thesis systematically evaluates linguistic research methods employed in comparative studies, focusing on their applications, benefits, and limitations. A historical overview of comparative linguistics is included to provide context, while primary sources include books, scholarly articles, and empirical studies in the field of linguistics.

Research Methodologies in Comparative Linguistics

1. Descriptive Method. The descriptive method involves the systematic analysis and documentation of linguistic features. It is foundational in comparative linguistics, providing the raw data for further analysis.

Process

- Collection of linguistic data through fieldwork: gather raw linguistic data directly from native speakers or written sources to document a language's structure and usage.

Methods:

Interviews with Native Speakers: Linguists may ask speakers to provide vocabulary, sentences, or narratives.

Audio/Visual Recordings: Capturing spoken language helps analyze pronunciation, intonation, and real-life usage.

eISSN: 2349-5715 pISSN: 2349-5707
Volume: 12, Issue 04, April-2025 SJIF 2019: 4.702 2020: 4.737 2021: 5.071 2022: 4.919 2023: 6.980 2024: 7,662

Texts and Historical Documents: For written languages, texts can provide additional data on grammar and vocabulary.
- Identification of phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and semantic features: break down the raw data into smaller linguistic units to analyse specific aspects of the language.
Aspects Studied:
Phonetics: Study of sounds (e.g., vowels, consonants, tones) and their articulation.
Example: Identifying how /k/ sounds differ between dialects.
Morphology: Study of word formation, including prefixes, suffixes, and roots.
Example: Analyzing how verbs change to indicate tense or aspect.
Syntax: Study of sentence structure and word order.
Example: Identifying whether the language uses SVO (subject-verb-object) or SOV (subject-object-verb) order.
Semantics: Study of meaning and interpretation of words and sentences.
Example: Understanding whether words have multiple meanings depending on context.
- Categorization and classification of linguistic phenomena: organize the identified linguistic features into categories and create a systematic description.
Steps:
Group similar features into categories (e.g., vowel types, noun cases, verb conjugations).
Compare these categories across dialects or other languages to identify patterns and anomalies.
Create grammatical descriptions and dictionaries for future reference.
Example: Categorizing Uzbek vowels into front (/i/, /e/) and back (/u/, /o/) vowels to document vowel harmony rules.

Feature	Uzbek	English
Vowel System	Rich (6 vowels)	Moderate (5 vowels)
Word Order	SOV	SVO

Table 1
The third line of the table compares the word order of Uzbek and English, referring to the typical arrangement of subject (S), object (O), and verb (V) in sentences [7; 284] . Here's a detailed explanation:
In Uzbek, the standard word order places the subject first, followed by the object, and finally the verb. This is characteristic of many Turkic languages.
Example:
Uzbek: Men kitobni o'qiyapman
Literal Translation: "I (S) the book (O) am reading (V)."
English Equivalent: "I am reading the book."
This SOV structure means that modifiers like adjectives or adverbs often precede the words they modify. Additionally, auxiliary verbs appear after the main verb, which is the opposite of English.
In English, the standard word order places the subject first, the verb second, and the object third.
Example:
English: "I (S) am reading (V) the book (O)."
English relies on this fixed SVO structure to convey relationships between sentence elements. Unlike Uzbek, English has less flexibility in word order, as grammatical relationships are not marked on nouns as extensively [5; 1057].
Evaluation

eISSN: 2349-5715 pISSN: 2349-5707
Volume: 12, Issue 04, April-2025 SJIF 2019: 4.702 2020: 4.737 2021: 5.071 2022: 4.919 2023: 6.980 2024: 7,662

While the descriptive method is indispensable, it is labour-intensive and often lacks theoretical generalizations. Additionally, challenges such as access to native speakers and ethical considerations in fieldwork are notable limitations.

2. Comparative-Historical Method: The comparative-historical method seeks to establish genetic relationships among languages by reconstructing proto-languages and studying their evolution.

- Identification of cognates: Find words in different languages that share a common origin. Cognates are words in related languages that have similar forms and meanings due to their descent from a shared ancestor word in a proto-language [1; 173].

Example:
English: mother
German: Mutter
Sanskrit: mātṛ
These words are cognates, tracing back to the Proto-Indo-European word méh₂tēr.

- Application of sound change laws: Analyze how sounds have systematically changed over time in related languages. Sound changes occur in predictable, regular patterns as languages evolve. These laws describe these patterns and help linguists trace linguistic history.

Grimm's Law: Describes how Proto-Indo-European voiceless stops (e.g., /p/, /t/, /k/) became voiceless fricatives (e.g., /f/, /θ/, /h/) in Germanic languages.
Latin pater → English father
The Great Vowel Shift: A series of changes in the pronunciation of English vowels during the Middle Ages.

- Reconstruction of proto-forms: Recreate the ancestral forms of words (proto-forms) in the hypothesized proto-language. Linguists use the identified cognates and sound change laws to work backward and infer what the ancestral word likely looked like. They apply the principle of regularity: sound changes are consistent, so proto-forms can be reconstructed with high confidence.

Examples:
From cognates:
Latin equus (“horse”), Sanskrit ashva (“horse”) → Reconstructed Proto-Indo-European h₁éḱwos.
By comparing similar grammatical structures or morphological features.
As an example, Indo-European language family has been extensively studied using this method, with reconstructed proto-forms like Ékwos (Latin “equus,” Sanskrit “ashva”).
This method is highly effective in reconstructing linguistic history but is limited to genetically related languages. It does not account for extensive borrowing or areal influences, which can obscure genetic relationships. Modern computational tools are increasingly used to refine reconstructions [2; 264].

3. Structural Method
The structural method analyzes the internal organization of language systems, emphasizing phonology, morphology, and syntax.

- Identification of linguistic units: Break the language into its smallest meaningful components, known as linguistic units, to study their roles and relationships within the language system [8; 377]. Linguistic units are the fundamental building blocks of language, organized into several levels:

Phonemes: The smallest units of sound that distinguish meaning.
Example: /p/ and /b/ in English differentiate pat and bat.
Morphemes: The smallest meaningful units of language.
Example: un- (prefix meaning “not”) + happy = unhappy.
Words: Single units of meaning made up of one or more morphemes.
Example: The word happiness contains two morphemes: happy + -ness.

eISSN: 2349-5715 pISSN: 2349-5707
Volume: 12, Issue 04, April-2025 SJIF 2019: 4.702 2020: 4.737 2021: 5.071 2022: 4.919 2023: 6.980 2024: 7,662

Phrases and Sentences: Higher-order units combining words in structured patterns.
Example: The cat sat on the mat (a sentence consisting of smaller phrases like the cat and on the mat).
By observing patterns in spoken or written language and using tools such as phonetic transcription, morphological analysis, and syntactic parsing the units can be identified clearly.
- Analysis of their hierarchical and functional relationships: Understand how linguistic units combine and interact to form larger structures and convey meaning within the language system. Linguistic units are arranged in levels or hierarchies, where smaller units (e.g., phonemes) combine to form larger ones (e.g., morphemes, words, sentences) [3; 139].
Example:
Phonemes → Morphemes → Words → Phrases → Sentences → Texts
This hierarchy shows how language is structured, with rules governing how each level interacts. Units serve specific roles or functions within the language.
Example: In the sentence The cat sat on the mat, the word cat functions as the subject, while sat functions as the verb.
Functions include grammatical roles (e.g., subject, object), syntactic relationships (e.g., modifiers, predicates), and phonological patterns (e.g., stress, intonation).
Methods of Analysis:
Syntactic Trees: Represent sentence structure hierarchically to show how words are related.
Example: A tree for The cat sat on the mat would show how the cat forms a noun phrase and sat on the mat forms a verb phrase.
Dependency Parsing: Analyzes functional relationships between words in a sentence.
Example: The cat (subject) is directly linked to sat (verb).
The structural method is instrumental in revealing language-specific and universal structures but often disregards historical and cultural factors. Recent developments in computational linguistics, such as phonological and syntactic parsing algorithms, have enhanced this method's application [6; 127].
4. Typological Method: The typological method classifies languages based on structural features, identifying universals and typological patterns.
- Selection of features for typological comparison (e.g., word order, case marking).
- Statistical analysis of feature distribution across languages.
The study of word order typology shows that 85% of world languages are either SOV or SVO.

Word Order	Examples of Languages
SOV	Uzbek, Japanese
SVO	English, Spanish
VSO	Arabic, Welsh

The typological method is invaluable for uncovering linguistic universals but may oversimplify complex linguistic phenomena. Modern statistical tools and machine learning methods are helping to refine typological studies [4;218].
5. Experimental Method: The experimental method employs controlled conditions to study linguistic phenomena, often involving psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic approaches [10; 85].
- Designing experiments to test hypotheses: Formulate and test specific linguistic hypotheses in controlled settings to draw empirical conclusions.
- Collecting and analyzing behavioral or neurophysiological data: Gather measurable data from participants and analyze it to confirm or refute the hypothesis.
Experiments comparing sentence processing in bilingual speakers of Spanish and English reveal differences in syntactic parsing strategies. The experimental method offers empirical insights but

eISSN: 2349-5715 pISSN: 2349-5707
Volume: 12, Issue 04, April-2025 SJIF 2019: 4.702 2020: 4.737 2021: 5.071 2022: 4.919 2023: 6.980 2024: 7,662

requires sophisticated equipment and is often resource-intensive. Ethical considerations and challenges in cross-linguistic experiment design must also be addressed [9; 421].

Conclusion

Comparative linguistics relies on diverse research methods, each offering unique insights into linguistic structures and relationships. The descriptive method lays the groundwork for all linguistic analysis, while the comparative-historical method reveals genetic links among languages. Structural and typological methods elucidate language-specific and universal patterns, and the experimental method provides empirical validation of linguistic theories.

The integration of these methods enhances the scope and depth of linguistic research, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of human language. By incorporating computational tools and corpus-based approaches, researchers can overcome limitations of traditional methods and address increasingly complex linguistic questions. Future research should prioritize this integration to further enrich the field of comparative linguistics.

References:

1. Baldi, P. An Introduction to the Indo-European Languages. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press. 1983, 232 p.
2. Campbell, L. Historical Linguistics: An Introduction. − Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. 2004, 448 p
3. Chomsky, N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. – Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. 1965, 261 p.
4. Croft, W. Typology and Universals. − Manchester: Cambridge University Press. Second edition. 2003, 333 p.
5. Dryer, M. S. Word Order Typology. In J.Jacobs, ed., Handbook of Syntax. – Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.Vol.2. 1996, P– 1050-1065.
6. Greenberg, J. H. Universals of Language. – Cambridge: MIT Press, 1963, – 288 p.
7. Haspelmath, M. Understanding Morphology. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, – 359 p.
8. Jakobson, R. Selected Writings. – Mouton: Mouton, 1962, – 405 p.
9. Kroll, J. F., & De Groot, A. M. Handbook of Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Approaches. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. – 602 p.
10. Marslen-Wilson, W. Functional Parallelism in Spoken Word Recognition. // Cognition, 1987. – P. 71-102.