

Diachronic Study of Phonetic Terms in English, Russian and Uzbek Languages

Kamalova DiloVar Azatkhanovna

senior teacher English language department of applied disciplines-3
English language faculty-3, Uzbekistan state world languages university,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

E-mail: dilyakamalova1@gmail.com

tel: +998 909785608

Abstract. The article deals with diachronic study of phonetic terms in English, Russian and Uzbek languages. However, terminology is by no means a static or unchanging layer of the vocabulary of a language. Progress in various fields of human activity causes continuous change and development of terminological systems due to the fact that the semantics of the term is by its nature not static, but dynamic.

Key words: diachronic study, phonetic terms, layer of the vocabulary, semantics of the term, terminological system, level of development.

Terminology should correspond to the modern level of development of various spheres of scientific, technical and social life. Therefore, the synchronous approach is considered to be the predominant direction in terminological studies [Golovin, 1987: 65; Danilenko, 1977: 15; Felber, 1984: 98], which involves the study of the modern nature of the term, the features of the functioning of various terminological systems, semantic, morphological, derivational aspects of terminology at the present stage of language development. At the same time, questions of the ordering of terminological systems are considered, the spheres of fixing terms, that is, stable terminological systems, are explored. This direction is presented in most studies on industry terminologies.

However, terminology is by no means a static or unchanging layer of the vocabulary of a language. Progress in various fields of human activity causes continuous change and development of terminological systems due to the fact that the semantics of the term is by its nature not static, but dynamic. In addition, a synchronous consideration of linguistic phenomena is always one-sided [Skrelina, 1973: 29]. This direction describes the observed processes, phenomena, but, as a rule, does not establish and does not explain their causes, while the dynamic nature of the term involves the identification of the mechanism and features of term-generating processes [Alekseeva, 1998: 7]. Consequently, only the study of terminology in its historical development, as many linguists believe [Guilbert, 1965: 332; Guilbert, 1975: 83; Dubois, 1971: 135; Denisov, 1970: 83; Bozhno, 1971: 103; Mechkovskaya, 1975: 201; Shevchuk, 1985:20; Grinev, 1993: 187; Kazarina, 1998: 60; Dianova, 2000: 9; Loktionova, 2001: 13], can give a clear and complete picture of the nature, methods and features of the formation of special vocabulary, justify the processes of term generation with real demands of a particular area of human knowledge. Knowledge of the history of the object allows a much better understanding of its current state and trends of further changes.

When studying terminology from diachronic positions, history is understood as the study of successive changes and development of the system of our knowledge in certain areas of science,

technology, nature, culture, etc. [Felde, 2001: 6]. The basis of the diachronic approach to the study of terminology is an attempt to overcome the well-known Saussurean dichotomy "synchrony-diachrony". Introduced at the beginning of the 20th century. F. de Saussure's opposition of synchrony and diachrony [Saussure, 1977: 83] emphasizes the contrast of two ways of considering linguistic phenomena: the study of a language at the moment and the study of linguistic development in its duration in time, while synchrony is absolutized in its opposition to diachrony and is proclaimed the only plane in which the language can be represented. Without a doubt, synchronous analysis, especially in relation to the current state of the language, is easier to implement in practice due to the greater completeness of the actual data and their availability. It is easier to test and verify. However, in synchronous linguistic studies, the language system appears as an immobile static object, a set of ready-made words, phrases, grammatical structures, phonemes, and strict rules for their compatibility [Shevchuk, 1985: 9].

Whereas only a structural-diachronic approach helps to understand how this language system has developed. Modern systemic diachrony expands the theoretical principles of Saussure's antinomy and tries to overcome it. Works of the Prague Linguistic Circle (1967), foreign and domestic linguists [Koseriu, 1963; Benveniste, 1974; Martinet, 1974; Zhirmunsky, 1958; Kubryakova, 1968; Skrelina, 1973] define the following approaches to diachronic and synchronous phenomena. Firstly, systemicity is present both in synchrony and diachrony, and secondly, diachronic analysis consists in determining the relationship between two successive structures and in establishing relationships between them, in other words, it allows you to find out which parts of the previous system have undergone change. Comparison of successive synchronicities reveals the systematic nature of diachronic studies. The essence of this antinomy, the principles of which are applied in this study, was most fully expressed by the founder of psychosystematics G. Guillaume, who noted that language is not only a system, but also a system of systems - a diachrony of synchrony [Lecons...de G. Guillaume, 1985 : 47].

The diachronic approach, using the chronological perspective represented by the various states of the language, makes it possible to record the changes taking place in the language as a process. Language dynamics is defined as a way of functioning (being) of a language family. Language changes in order to continue to function [Coseriu, 1963: 150], although at the same time it may appear unchanged on the surface, as it must keep up with the changing needs of communication and expression. In all areas of the life of the language, development takes place, artificially divided by researchers into stages, gradually passing one into another. The development of terminology is also an ongoing process. Term systems, on the one hand, are integral and stable formations for a certain period of time. On the other hand, taking into account the progressive development inherent in science and technology, we can also talk about changes in the terminology serving them: the terminological composition is expanding quantitatively, the meanings of many terms undergo qualitative shifts, neologism terms appear, some special words are removed from active use. At the same time, the "patchwork" of terminology is always revealed [Denisov, 1970: 82], which becomes apparent when comparing certain chronological intervals, reflecting different socio-historical and linguistic conditions and various stages of the formation of terminological systems.

Reference

1. Ivanov, A.V. System-functional approach in terminology text. / A.V. Ivanov // Res philologica: Scientific notes. Issue. IV. Arkhangelsk: PTU, 2005.-P. 90-100.
2. Kasyanov, V.V. Comparative analysis of modern terminology of financial activity in English and Russian languages: author. dis. . cand. philol. sciences text. / V.V. Kasyanov. M., 2001. - 24 p.