

**Ekaterine Maruashvili**

**Doctor of Philology, Tbilisi Humanitarian Teaching University(Georgia)**

**Various areas within macro linguistics**

**DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52340/isj.2022.24.02>**

linguistics, the scientific study of language. The word was first used in the middle of the 19th century to emphasize the difference between a newer approach to the study of language that was then developing and the more traditional approach of philology. The differences were and are largely matters of attitude, emphasis, and purpose. The philologist is concerned primarily with the historical development of languages as it is manifest in written texts and in the context of the associated literature and culture. The linguist, though he may be interested in written texts and in the development of languages through time, tends to give priority to spoken languages and to the

The field of linguistics may be divided in terms of three dichotomies: synchronic versus diachronic, theoretical versus applied, and microlinguistics versus macrolinguistics. A synchronic description of a language describes the language as it is at a given time; a diachronic description is concerned with the historical development of the language and the structural changes that have taken place in it. The goal of theoretical linguistics is the construction of a general theory of the structure of language or of a general theoretical framework for the description of languages; the aim of applied linguistics is the application of the findings and techniques of the scientific study of language to practical tasks, especially to the elaboration of improved methods of language teaching. The terms microlinguistics and macrolinguistics are not yet well established, and they are, in fact, used here purely for convenience. The former refers to a narrower and the latter to a much broader view of the scope of linguistics. According to the micro linguistic view, languages should be analyzed for their own sake and without reference to their social function, to the manner in which they are acquired by children, to the psychological mechanisms that underlie the production and reception of speech, to the literary and the aesthetic or communicative function of language, and so on. In contrast, macrolinguistics embraces all of these aspects of language. Various areas within macro linguistics have been given terminological recognition: psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropological linguistics, dialectology, mathematical and computational linguistics, and stylistics. Macro linguistics should not be identified with applied linguistics. The application of linguistic methods and concepts to language teaching may well involve other disciplines in a way that micro linguistics does not. But there is, in principle, a theoretical aspect to every part of macro linguistics, no less than to micro linguistics.

A large portion of this article is devoted to theoretical, synchronic micro linguistics, which is generally acknowledged as the central part of the subject; it will be abbreviated henceforth as theoretical linguistics. Linguistic speculation and investigation, insofar as is known, has gone on in only a small number of societies. To the extent that Mesopotamian, Chinese, and Arabic learning dealt with grammar, their treatments were so enmeshed in the particularities of those languages and so little known to the European world until recently that

they have had virtually no impact on Western linguistic tradition. Chinese linguistic and philological scholarship stretches back for more than two millennia, but the interest of those scholars was concentrated largely on phonetics, writing, and lexicography; their consideration of grammatical problems was bound up closely with the study of logic.

Certainly, the most interesting non-Western grammatical tradition—and the most original and independent—is that of India, which dates back at least two and one-half millennia and which culminates with the grammar of Panini, of the 5th century BCE. There are three major ways in which the Sanskrit tradition has had an impact on modern linguistic scholarship. As soon as Sanskrit became known to the Western learned world, the unravelling of comparative Indo-European grammar ensued, and the foundations were laid for the whole 19th-century edifice of comparative philology and historical linguistics. But, for this, Sanskrit was simply a part of the data; Indian grammatical learning played almost no direct part. Nineteenth-century workers, however, recognized that the native tradition of phonetics in ancient India was vastly superior to Western knowledge, and this had important consequences for the growth of the science of phonetics in the West. Third, there is in the rules or definitions (sutras) of Panini a remarkably subtle and penetrating account of Sanskrit grammar. The construction of sentences, compound nouns, and the like is explained through ordered rules operating on underlying structures in a manner strikingly similar in part to modes of modern theory. As might be imagined, this perceptive Indian grammatical work held great fascination for 20th-century theoretical linguists. A study of Indian logic in relation to Paninian grammar alongside Aristotelian and Western logic in relation to Greek grammar and its successors could bring illuminating insights. Whereas in ancient China learning a separate field of study that might be called grammar scarcely took root, in ancient India a sophisticated version of this discipline developed early alongside the other sciences. Even though the study of Sanskrit grammar may originally have had the practical aim of keeping the sacred Vedic texts and their commentaries pure and intact, the study of grammar in India in the 1st millennium BCE had already become an intellectual end in itself.

The emergence of grammatical learning in Greece is less clearly known than is sometimes implied, and the subject is more complex than is often supposed; here only the main strands can be sampled. The term *hē grammatikē technē* (“the art of letters”) had two senses. It meant the study of the values of the letters and of accentuation and prosody and, in this sense, was an abstract intellectual discipline; and it also meant the skill of literacy and thus embraced applied pedagogy. This side of what was to become “grammatical” learning was distinctly applied, particular, and less exalted by comparison with other pursuits. Most of the developments associated with theoretical grammar grew out of philosophy and criticism; and in these developments a repeated duality of themes crosses and intertwines. Much of Greek philosophy was occupied with the distinction between that which exists “by nature” and that which exists “by convention.” So, in language it was natural to account for words and forms as ordained by nature (by onomatopoeia—i.e., by imitation of natural sounds) or as arrived at arbitrarily by a social convention. This dispute regarding the origin of language and meanings paved the way for the development of divergences between the views of the “analogists,” who looked on language as possessing an essential regularity as a result of the symmetries that convention can provide, and the views of the “anomalists,” who pointed to language’s lack of regularity as one facet of the inescapable irregularities of nature. The situation was more complex, however, than this statement would suggest. For example, it seems that the anomalists among the Stoics credited the irrational quality of language precisely to the claim that language did not exactly mirror nature. In any event, the anomalist tradition in the hands of the Stoics brought grammar the benefit of

their work in logic and rhetoric. This led to the distinction that, in modern theory, is made with the terms significant (“what signifies”) and signifié (“what is signified”) or, somewhat differently and more elaborately, with “expression” and “content”; and it laid the groundwork of modern theories of inflection, though by no means with the exhaustiveness and fine-grained analysis reached by the Sanskrit grammarians. The Alexandrians, who were analogists working largely on literary criticism and text philology, completed the development of the classical Greek grammatical tradition. Dionysius Thrax, in the 2nd century BCE, produced the first systematic grammar of Western tradition; it dealt only with word morphology. The study of sentence syntax was to wait for Apollonius Dyscolus, of the 2nd century CE. Dionysius called grammar “the acquaintance with [or observation of] what is uttered by poets and writers,” using a word meaning a less general form of knowledge than what might be called “science.” His typically Alexandrian literary goal is suggested by the headings in his work: pronunciation, poetic figurative language, difficult words, true and inner meanings of words, exposition of form-classes, literary criticism. Dionysius defined a sentence as a unit of sense or thought, but it is difficult to be sure of his precise meaning. The Romans, who largely took over, with mild adaptations to their highly similar language, the total work of the Greeks, are important not as originators but as transmitters. Aelius Donatus, of the 4th century CE, and Priscian, an African of the 6th century, and their colleagues were slightly more systematic than their Greek models but were essentially retrospective rather than original. Up to this point a field that was at times called grammatical was a congeries of investigations, both theoretical and practical, drawn from the work and interests of literacy, scribe ship, logic, epistemology, rhetoric, textual philosophy, poetics, and literary criticism. Yet modern specialists in the field still share their concerns and interests. The anomalists, who concentrated on surface irregularity and who looked then for regularities deeper down (as the Stoics sought them in logic) bear a resemblance to contemporary scholars of the transformationalist school. And the philological analogists with their regularizing surface segmentation show striking kinship of spirit with the modern school of structural (or taxonomic or glossematics) grammatical theorists.

#### Bibliography:

- [1].Naom Chomsky “The Precipice”, 2021.
- [2].Naom Chomsky “Who Rules the World?”,2014.

**Екатерине Маруашвили**

**Доктор Филологии, тбилисский гуманитарный учебный университет(Грузия)**

#### **Различные области макролингвистики**

Область языкознания почти полностью забыла о достижениях этого периода. Изучающие грамматику имели тенденцию видеть вершинами в своей области достижения греков, рост эпохи Возрождения и «повторное открытие» обучения (что привело непосредственно к современным школьным традициям), современный расцвет теоретического обучения (люди обычно находят свои собственные эпоха важная и захватывающая), а с середины 20-го века удивительный памятник Панини. Многие

лингвисты сочли неподходящим сочетание средневекового изучения латыни и досовременной философии. Тем не менее, можно разумно ожидать, что средневековые ученые завещали современной науке плоды более чем обычно утонченных восприятий определенного порядка. Эти ученые использовали, писали и изучали латынь, язык, который, хотя и не был их родным языком, был языком, в котором они чувствовали себя как дома; такие ученые в группах, должно быть, часто представляли весьма разнообразный языковой фон. Некоторые средневековые трактаты продолжают традицию грамматик поздней античности; так, есть версии, основанные на Донате и Присциане, часто с меньшим включением классических поэтов и писателей. Другой жанр письма предполагает одновременное рассмотрение грамматических различий и схоластической логики; современные лингвисты, вероятно, недостаточно подготовлены для работы с этими письменами. Цель грамматиков состояла в том, чтобы исследовать, как слово (элемент языка) соответствует вещам, воспринимаемым умом, и как оно обозначает реальность. Поскольку слово не может прямо обозначать природу реальности, оно должно обозначать обозначаемую вещь в одном из ее модусов или свойств; именно этому различению модусов и посвящено изучение категорий и частей речи. Таким образом, изучение предложений должно вести к природе реальности через модусы значения.