

IMPORTANCE OF CREATIVITY AND GENERATIVITY IN LINGUISTICS

ABDURAKHMANOVA RANO KOSIMOVNA

*The Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan of the Andijan Academic Lyceum
Department of Language Studies, Ph.D Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences*

Abstract

This article devoted to the topic creativity and generativity in linguistics. Moreover, theoretical views of famous linguists about the theme were highlighted.

Key words: mental grammar , deep-seated regularities human language, generating, systematic principles, erzeugen, generate, speaker-hearer.

The primary characteristic of mental grammar is its ability to generate new words and sentences that have not been uttered before, making it a creative process. The principles governing this process are systematic and are known unconsciously by every speaker. Creativity is perhaps the most significant feature of human language. By stating that human languages are creative, we are not merely referring to their capacity to produce beautiful poetry and literature. Instead, we imply that every language can convey any conceivable idea. This idea may appear surprising initially, but every language can create an endless array of novel words and sentences, despite having a finite vocabulary.

The lexicon of a language may be extensive, but it is still limited. Furthermore, each language has a restricted and finite set of rules for combining those words. Nevertheless, each language can employ that finite vocabulary and finite set of principles to produce an infinite variety of sentences, fresh sentences every day. Similarly, each language has a finite collection of sounds and a finite set of rules for combining those sounds. Every language can use those finite resources to originate an endless range of possible new words in that language. Since human languages can all create new words and create new sentences, we describe human grammar as generative. Keep in mind that when we refer to "grammar" in linguistics, we are not referring to the prescriptive regulations that your Grade 6 teacher attempted to enforce, but to mental grammar, the concepts in our minds that all language speakers share, allowing us to comprehend one another. Mental grammar is generative[1]. The last, and perhaps most important, thing to understand

d about language creativity is that it is guided by systematic principles. Every fluent speaker of a language employs systematic principles to combine sounds to construct words and to combine words to construct sentences.

The famous linguists Chomsky and Humboldt share an interest in developing theories about the inventive dimension of language. Chomsky aims to explicitly construct a model for this purpose. Additionally, it is widely recognized within traditional linguistic theory that an essential characteristic of all languages is their capacity for creativity. This means that language provides a means for expressing an infinite number of ideas and for responding suitably to an endless range of novel situations. To account for this creative aspect of language, a universal grammar must supplement the grammar of any particular language, and it must express the fundamental regularities that are universal and therefore omitted from the grammar itself. Humboldt, too, is intrigued by the inventive dimension of language. He asserts that "the revelation of man's mental powers" is the ultimate goal of all spiritual endeavors, and the ultimate concept that world history must clearly manifest. This implies that his goal

is also the revelation of man's mental powers, which encompasses but is not limited to the creative aspect of language. This mental power is "truly creative," and can be uncovered through "the comparative study of languages, the precise identification of the numerous ways in which countless peoples solve the same task of language formation that they are assigned as human beings.

"Chomsky says (in defense of his use of the term "generate" in "generative grammar") that "'generate' seems to be the most appropriate translation for Humboldt's term *erzeugen*, which he frequently uses, it seems, in essentially the sense here intended". Indeed, Humboldt's term *erzeugen*, like Chomsky's "generate", represents a concept of creativity in language[3]. His term also appears to denote not any particular production of a single utterance, but an "underlying competence as a system of generative processes", as Chomsky describes it, in the same way that "a generative grammar is not a model for a speaker or a hearer", but a "characterization of the knowledge of the language that provides the basis for actual use of language by a speaker-hearer". Chomsky compared "generate" to *erzeugen* when trying to make exactly this distinction for the meaning of "generate", so perhaps there were no relevant differences between Chomsky's "generate" and Humboldt's *erzeugen* when Chomsky made this comparison. However, there are in fact essential differences between what Chomsky means by "generate" and what Humboldt means by *erzeugen*, and underlying these are essential differences between their concepts of creativity in language.

A generative grammar as conceived by Chomsky in *Aspects* is not self-modifying; its output does not even change. Humboldt's creativity is not only a process whose output changes depending on what has already been produced, but is also a process that modifies itself, or gives life to new, different processes. "It is the outstanding peculiarity of the spirit, enlarging the concept of human intellectuality, and emerging in a manner unexpected, and, in the ultimate depths of its appearance, inexplicable[4]. It is especially marked out by the fact that its products are not mere foundations on which further construction can be effected, but carry within them at the same time the rekindling breath that engenders them. They propagate life, because it is from full life that they proceed. For the power that produces them works with the tension of its whole endeavour and in its full unity, yet at the same time truly creatively, regarding its own procreation as something inexplicable even to itself; it has not just seized upon novelty by chance, or merely latched on to the already known[5]." Humboldt metaphorically equates human intellectuality with "rekindling breath", thereby comparing the result of human intellectuality including language to fire. Fire is a process that can grow and produce itself; it can bring about more fire. Thus Humboldt's conception of language is one of a self-producing process. When Humboldt says "the products of human intellectuality propagate life", he implies the same result: that language grows and produces itself.

Sum up, all given facts above, linguistic individuals have the ability to convey specific meanings through discourse. Both writers/speakers and readers/listeners engage in communication by means of discourse, forming a mutual agreement. This form of "mediated" communication takes place in specific historical, ethnic, cultural, and social contexts. Along with the author's intentions, cultural, social, and historical information can be conveyed through discourse. Therefore, discourse analysis assists in identifying universal and regular features of language systems, ethnic and cultural distinctions, and the unique linguistic characteristics of individual language users, which enable them to express their creative potential. Linguistic individuals continuously construct discourses by selecting linguistic units to express their ideas and thoughts. Discourse, a complex communicative phenomenon with both linguistic and extra-linguistic aspects, provides a fertile ground for language abilities to be explored. Discourse serves as a testing laboratory for creative linguistic individuals to display their creativity by rethinking rules and reforming language patterns to benefit from its potential properties and successfully communicate their message.

References

1. Elizabeth Coppock, Creativity, Generative Grammar, and Erzeugung. October 11, 2004
2. Catherine Anderson. Essentials of linguistics. MC master University Hamilton, Ontario.
3. Balota, D. A., & Chumbley, J. I. (1984). Are lexical decisions a good measure of lexical access? The role of word frequency in the neglected decision stage. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, Human Perception and Performance*, 10(3), 340–57.
4. Bowden, H. W., Steinhauer, K., Sanz, C., & Ullman, M. T. (2013). Native-like brain processing of syntax can be attained by university foreign language learners. *Neuropsychologia*, 51(13), 2492–2511.
5. Dickey, M. W., Choy, J. J., & Thompson, C. K. (2007). Real-time comprehension of wh-movement in aphasia: evidence from eyetracking while listening. *Brain and Language*, 100(1), 1–22.