ISCKMC 2022
International Scientific Congress «KNOWLEDGE, MAN AND CIVILIZATION»

SYSTEMATICITY AS A CONDITION FOR THE MANIFESTATION OF EMERGENCE IN SPEECH UNITS

Nurvadi Nasruddinovich Albekov (a)*, Aza Ablulvakhidovna Yakhyaeva (b),
Taisa Dzaindievna Magomadova (c)
*Corresponding author

(a) Chechen State University, named by A-H Kadirov, 32, Sharipov str., Grozny, Russia, alibecus@mail.ru
Academy of science of Chechen Republic, 13, Esambaeva str. Grozny, Russia, alibecus@mail.ru
(b) Chechen State Pedagogical University, 62, Isaeva str., Grozny, Russia, aza_yakhyaeva@mail.ru
(c) Groznenski State Oil University, 100, Isaeva str., Grozny, Russia, tay666@mail.ru

Abstract

The article provides a rationale for the property of emergence which manifests itself in speech units in terms of the systemic whole. Language exists in a transformed form, which manifests itself in speech units. The transformed form of language manifests itself in different guises – sounds or graphic signs. Speech units, being countless variant compositions of the language system, have a clear systematization and absolute uniqueness in terms of the emergence. The only question concerns the level of the linguistic universe for an analysis of the emergence properties of the product of the language system and the system itself. No matter how perfect and voluminous the speech unit is, in terms of the emergence of the language system, it remains only a subsystem, and, accordingly, all the emergent properties of the language system cannot manifest themselves in it. The inability of the text to show all the emergent properties of the language system is due to the inability to reflect all the factors of objective reality in the global perception and interpretation of the world picture, the diversity of interpretations based on the individual perception of the same text in different conditions and eras. Accordingly, the speech unit can designate a model of the language system, congruent to the structural and semantic structure of the language system to the modern period of the text.

Keywords: Emergence, language system, structural model

1. Introduction

To define the concept of emergence, it is necessary to analyze its essential characteristics in different systems. It may seem that many interpretations of emergence that exist in certain fields are identical. However, only by determining a generalizing condition and establishing its individual characteristics in each field, we can talk about the emergence as a whole (Albekov, 2015a).

2. Problem Statement

The main thing that is an unconditional condition for the manifestation of emergence is the presence of a system. There is no emergence without a system and, accordingly, in order to understand the emergence, it is necessary to study the concept of system, its main properties and characteristics. The system, being a multicomponent, complex structural organization, predicts synergistic processes both within the structural units and in the entire system as a whole. Although each of the components is endowed with a specific function and has a specific functional and structural property, in the system they act as a counterbalance to each other, thus creating a certain paradigm, the law according to which the system as a whole works (Albekov, 2015b).

The study of the mechanism in terms of the system has become an objective necessity, subject to a detailed analysis of the mechanism. According to von Bertalanffy (1962), in modern reality the concept of system should not be limited to a purely theoretical sphere.

In studying the nature of the system, the works by Krainyuchenko and Popov (2005) are significant, as they provide definitions of the system.

A distinctive feature that unites the definitions of the system is the presence of components, elements, parts, etc., which are connected and interact with each other. The emergent properties of some systems are not amenable to the empirical analysis by modern technology. Some dogmatic statements about the nature of systems, in particular the linguistic ones, carry the danger of developing a false direction in science.

3. Research Questions

In the context of the study of language as a system, two main directions have been identified: language as a material system and language as an ideal system. Solntsev (1973) defines material systems as systems that consist of substances of a material property that are in relationships. The very concept of a system is initially material. There are primary material and secondary material systems. The difference between primary and secondary material systems is due to the different role of material substances and material elements in these systems. Ideal systems are characterized by a "division" of the system of semantic information from the primary material system. The material elements of this material system are endowed by people with a function of storing and expressing ideas, which is not inherent in their own nature.

In this context, an example of the classification of nouns in the Chechen language is interesting. In the Chechen language there is no strict division of nouns into animate and inanimate, and there is no

category of gender. All words are divided into two large groups – classes of man and classes of things. Instead of the category of gender, the category of grammatical class includes six classes. Each class has its own auxiliary linking verb *wu (yu, boo, du)* "is" in singular and plural. Accordingly, the question on what basis nouns, especially those denoting things, acquired this or that verb as a link, is inexplicable. For example, the seasons are bIaste yu (spring), ahke yu (summer), guire yu (autumn) and Ia du (winter). It would seem that in concepts related in terms of the nomination, the noun Ia (winter) should also refer to the third declension, i.e., have a verb linkage yu, like the other three ones. Nevertheless, Ia has a bunch of du and refers to the fourth declension. The belonging of the noun Ia to the fourth declension due to the influence of an individual, an agreement between a group is not rational due to the fact that the remaining lexemes denoting the seasons have a different declension. Under the conventional consistency, it would be easier to designate season 1a with the verb copula yu, like the rest of the lexemes. However, there are no conventions in truth. The fact that in the system of the Russian language the sound k is used as a preposition is true. The fact that in place of the sound k there could be another sound that performs the same function is an assumption that does not have a reasoned evidence base. The question of whether it is possible to explain such phenomena based on purely material aspects, and what material phenomena formed the basis for the idea of classifying these nouns remains open.

4.   Purpose of the Study

It is known that language exists in a transformed form. In this context, the opinion by Mamardashvili is interesting. He believes that:

the feature of the transformed form is that in it, in contrast to the classical form and content, meaningful definitions consist in objective elimination, i.e. the form of manifestation has its own "essential", it is isolated, as a result of which other relations are acquired between content and form, which merge with the properties of material carriers (substrates) of the forms themselves and take the place of real relations (Mamardashvili, 1992, p. 270).

One of the most significant entities of the system is its goal. The goal is also recognized by Anokhin (1973), who believes that "goal is a functional set of material formations that interact in order to achieve a certain result" (p. 22). According to Knyazeva (2000) "goal of the the object is the designation of the main direction in the present period, as for its behavior, it is due precisely to the designated vector of activity" (p. 54).

In modern linguistics, the language system is considered as a series of interrelated concepts - language levels, language units: paradigmatics, syntagmatics, synchrony, diachrony, external and internal language connections, etc. Each of these levels is a mini-system within the language system.

Karpov (1992) defines activity as an attitude towards a person in material, practical and intellectual operations. Based on the activity approach to the language system, Karpov (1992) defines "language as a system derived from the linguistic universe, representing the total product of the verbal and mental activity of individuals" (p. 15).

An interesting work on the language system based on the material of the Russian language was presented by Peterson, who identified the problem that needs to be solved in order to study the language as a system. It consists in establishing what relationships exist between the phenomena of a language in a given era and how these relationships develop in the history of a language, depending on the communication needs of the society speaking the language. According to Peterson (1952),

the task of a linguist who studies language as a system is not to present the language tiers – phonetics, morphology, syntax, vocabulary, - but to present the relationships between these levels. Peterson identified twenty-six such relationships at different language levels. (p. 87)

In studies of the language system based on structuralism, there are opinions about the concepts of structure and system. Psycholinguistic and situational circumstances remain undstudied. Melnikov (1973) believes that "the study of language in terms of its structure is acceptable if the properties of the elements expressed in structural terms are also reflected in structural models" (p. 184).

The structural model does not fully reflect the emergent property of the system, because the system in relation to the structure is a whole, the emergent properties of which are limited structurally. Accordingly, the emergence of a system is not only the result of the structure. Extralinguistic factors are also important.

Since language is a universal system, it cannot be limited to a single classification. Accordingly, there are properties that manifest themselves from the standpoint of the functional goal of this system – the ability of language to be an intermediary between two dynamic systems. According to Plato, "the eidos of a thing, being a certain generality and a certain singularity, is an integrity that ensures the integrity of a thing as an organism and its qualitative certainty" (Zubkova, 2003, p. 27).

According to Whorf (1960), language contributes to the "expression" of what has already been folded in the main features in thoughts. He believes that the formation of thought is an independent process, which is usually called "thinking". A similar idea can be traced in Luria (1998), who believes that the emergence of a phrase from individual words, which leads to the emergence of a phraseological unit, must be put in a different form, namely: is the primary thought or idea the basis of the statement, which only then turns into a system of words that materializes in a specific form?

The study of various hypotheses makes it possible to assume that the language system is a symbiosis of ideas; therefore, to consider language only through the prism of instinctive phenomena is fraught with the threat of distorting the truth (Tallerman, 2005). At the same time, in modern linguistics, there is some methodological stagnation caused by excessive traditionalism. In this context, the study of language and speech from the point of view of the emergence property provides an opportunity to analyze the language in the aggregate of both purely linguistic aspects and extralinguistic realities that are directly related to the problem of emergence of language and its development. Extralinguistic factors are also essential in the interpretation, since in many speech situations, it is on the basis of extralinguistic factors that a semantic whole is created. In this context, the definition by Cicourel (1969) is correct. He states that "the concept of an interpretive procedure is a mechanism that enables a member of society to determine the situational relevance of linguistic and social knowledge" (p. 51).

5.   Research Methods

The main method applied in the research is the emergence field method and the method of linguistic abstraction.

6.   Findings

In order to indicate the options for interpreting the same speech situation, we conducted a control work among students of the Chechen State University. The purpose of the work was to identify the potential of the field of emergence and this speech situation. The speech situation itself was given by a sentence that has no emergence. Although it sounds rather absurd, in this example it is absolutely real, since emergence is the presence of form and content in a single complete whole. As an example of the text in which there is no emergence, we took a sentence invented by Academician Shcherba (2004) – "*Гло́кая ку́здра* штéко будлану́ла бо́кра и курдя́чит бокрёнка" (p. 321). The task was to interpret the sentence, while maintaining the designated grammatical structure. Below there are several interpretations: *"The hungry chicken quickly pecked at the bread and the poor thing cackles", "The little girl clearly deceived her mother and runs away into the house", "The silly duck suddenly took a sip of water and finds oblivion", "A huge bull-calf quickly drove the dog away and calms the cow ".*

Having analyzed the interpretations, we found that the deterministic chaos created various interpretations between which there is no semantic synonymy, which can be explained by a small number (67) of participants. However, we did not pursue the goal of identifying the entire potential of PE, given by the speech situation, the basis of which is the sentence. Taking into account the results of previous works, we are sure that it is possible to designate the potential of fuzzy linguistic sets applicable in the semantic models for the interpretation of this speech situation. As for the emergence of the text itself, its originality is clear in the analysis of each of the options for interpreting the speech situation, i.e. originality, uniqueness, integrity, structural and semantic completeness, associativity of perception and, accordingly, variability of interpretations in specific lexical units, united by the common meaning of the whole. All this gives emergence to each of the interpretations.

Of all the numerous components of the language system, the text and the sentence are the units of speech. However, unlike the sentence, the text is the largest unit of speech, in which almost all the resources of the language system are manifested. Based on the fact that the text is the most complete model of the language system, the question arises: is it possible to determine the emergence of the language system in analyzing the text? We analyzed different texts in Russian, English and Chechen, written in different genres and volumes.

The text is a linguistic system in which the components of the language system are manifested. In this context, the opinion by Afanasiev (1980), who claims that "each system is always a component of another, higher level system" is correct.

7.   Conclusion

No matter how perfect and volumetric linguistic unit the text is, from the point of view of the emergence of the language system, it remains a subsystem, and, accordingly, all the emergent properties of the language system cannot appear in the text. The inability of the text to show all the emergent properties of the language system is due to the inability to reflect the totality of factors of objective reality in the aspect of global perception and interpretation of the world picture, the diversity of interpretations based on the individual perception of the same text in different conditions and eras.

References

Afanasiev, V. G. (1980). *Consistency and society.* Moscow.

Albekov, N. N. (2015a). Emergence as an object of modern science. *Modern problems of science and education, 2*. http://www.science-education.ru/122-21089

Albekov, N. N. (2015b). Emergence field in the structure of the speech situation. *Modern problems of science and education, 2*. www.science-education.ru/122-20901

Anokhin, P. K. (1973). *Fundamental questions of the general theory of functional systems.* Science. http://www.bio.bsu.by/phha/downloads/anohin_obscaia_teoria_fs.pdf

Cicourel, A. (1969). *Generative Semantics and the Structure of Social Interaction. International Days of Sociolinguislic*. Rome.

Karpov, V. A. (1992). *Language as a system.* Minsk.

Knyazeva, E. N. (2000). 30 years of synergetics. *Questions of Philosophy, 3*, 53–61.

Krainyuchenko, I. V., & Popov, V. P. (2005). *Definition of the term "system".* http://holism.narod.ru/Systems/3.htm

Luria, A. R. (1998). *Language and consciousness.* Moscow State University.

Mamardashvili, M. (1992). Transformed Forms: On the Necessity of Irrational Expressions. In: *How I Understand Philosophy* (pp. 270–271). Progress.

Melnikov, G. P. (1973). Language as a system and language universals. *System Research. Yearbook 1972*, 183–204. Science.

Peterson, M. N. (1952). *Introduction to linguistics*. Moscow.

Shcherba, L. V. (2004). *Language system and speech activity* (2nd, ed. stereotypical). Editorial URSS.

Solntsev, V. M. (1973). *Language as a system-structural formation*. Moscow.

Tallerman, M. (2005). Introduction: Language origins and evolutionary processes. In M. Tallerman (Ed.), *Language Origins: Perspectives on Evolution* (pp. 1–10). Oxford University Press.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1962). General System Theory–A Critical Review. In: *General Systems*. Vol. VII (pp. 1–20).

Whorf, B. L. (1960). On two erroneous views on speech and thinking that characterize the system of natural logic, and on how words and customs affect thinking. In: *Science and Linguistics (New in Linguistics)*. Issue 1. Moscow. http://www.philology.ru/linguistics1/worf-60a.htm

Zubkova, L. G. (2003). *Language as a form*. Moscow.