



DIACHRONIC ASPECT OF LINGUISTIC PICTURES OF THE WORLD

Mukhlisa Choriyeva

PhD student of BSU

m.j.chorieva@buxdu.uz

Abstract: *The goal of the research was to explore the linguistic picture of the world generally and leaning its aspects. Key features of diachronic aspect of linguistic picture of the world were studied in this paper.*

Key words: *Linguistic picture of the word, diachronic, conceptual, culture, keyword research, cultural words.*

The picture of the world is the central fundamental concept of the understanding of man. With the help of mediating structures, a person forms an image of the world as the basis of his life activity. Human imagination creates images of being that are historically transient. The picture of the world is a holistic, global image of the world, which is the result of all spiritual human activity. The formation of this image is manifested in the creation of various symbolic structures necessary for orienting a person in the real world.

The picture of the world is the foundation laid by various contacts with the world and the comprehension of these contacts, on which new knowledge and ideas about the world are superimposed. Therefore, it cannot always be revealed in the acts of a person's self-reflection. The picture of the world is embodied in various semiotic structures, based on which, it can be reconstructed. Language is involved in two processes associated with the picture of the world. Firstly, it forms a linguistic picture of the world (LPW); secondly, with the help of language, another human picture of the world is expressed. With the help of language, the experiential knowledge of individuals is transformed into collective experience.

The picture of the world is an abstract entity modeled through the analysis of human activity, that is, culture in the broadest sense of the word. The linguistic picture of the world (LPW) is the PW modeled in the language by the collective subject. LPW is a reflection of PW in the language, but such a reflection is not always consistent and accurate enough. Compared to language, human thinking is more mobile and richer. Analyzing linguistic data in an anthropological way, we can approach the modeling of a linguistic picture of the world, which is very close to the actual picture of the world that forms its deep layer. Another aspect of PW is the conceptual picture of the world (CPW), which is expressed in the logic of the LPW structure. For each period, the components of these concepts partially coincide. The elements of the LPW are linguistic units, including semantic fields, while the conceptual ones are units of a more abstract plan, "consciousness constants". Therefore, LPW seems to be more mobile and changeable than CPW, which is distinguished by its stability and versatility. LPW is fragmented, while CPW is more systemic and ordered. At the same time, LPW is, of course, conditioned by CPW.



The study of LPW in English linguistics began with the study of the lexical system of the language, which is determined by the categories of the material world and social factors. The distinctive properties of the vocabulary of specific languages are expressed in the division of the lexical meaning of words, in word connections (syntagmatic, paradigmatic and epigrammatic). The analysis of these properties helps the researcher to get closer to the representation of a certain fragment of the LPW.

Concepts in different cultures receive different “development”, which is manifested in the vocabulary of the language, in particular, in the number of lexical units expressing certain meanings. Obviously, the more significant a concept is for a certain culture, the more means of linguistic expression it receives. The cultural significance of the expressed meanings is also determined by the frequency of use of the lexical units expressing them. Although an objective measurement of word frequency is impossible, as it will always depend on the length and corpus and the choice of contexts included in it, this indicator of cultural significance can provide valuable information about the relevance of a given concept to a native speaker. At the same time, numerical indications are not a valuable source of cultural elaboration of concepts and should be considered in the context of a thorough semantic analysis.

In studying the relationship between the vocabulary of a language and culture, the principle of “key words” is important. “Keywords” are especially important words for a particular culture. The status of a key word for a certain culture can be given to a word that is commonly used, functioning in a certain semantic sphere, included in a large number of precedent texts (proverbs, sayings, popular songs, well-known literary works, etc.), included in a number of phraseological units.

Keyword research allows you to draw significant conclusions about a particular culture. In the context of the principle of consistency in modern linguistic research, the study of cultural keywords is not limited to atomistic studies of individual words. Key words can be analyzed as the centers of certain cultural areas. “By carefully examining these central points, we may be able to demonstrate general organizational principles <...>, often having explanatory power <...>”.

The reconstruction of fragments of the picture of the world, carried out on the basis of the modern language, reveals some contradictions, explained by the mosaic nature of the reflection of reality in the language, which connects not synchronous, but multi-temporal representations of native speakers. LPW reflects the entire experience of cognition of reality by a certain linguistic community. As a result, LPW not only reflects ideas about the world that are relevant for a modern person, but also imposes historically developed perceptions on native speakers.

The diachronic problem of the picture of the world in modern science is dealt with by diachronic linguistics, ethnolinguistics (and linguoculturology). Actual ideas about the world at a certain chronological stage can only be revealed by analyzing the neologisms of this stage and correlating them with the inherited language fund in terms of compliance / non-compliance with it. In the field of vocabulary, this is feasible using the methods of historical lexicology and etymology. At the same time, the evolution of an ethnic group's



ideas about something can be revealed only as a result of a massive diachronic study of linguistic material with its stratification by chronological stages. The goal of ethnolinguistics is the linguistic expression of the traditional culture of an ethnic group. The development of this area of linguistics began with the study of vocabulary denoting elementary phenomena of material culture. Since such studies provided little information directly about the picture of the world of a native speaker, attention was paid to non-equivalent vocabulary from the spiritual and social spheres, and then to “cultural words” (such as soul, love), reflecting cultural originality at the connotative level. However, in recent decades, ethnolinguistics has been striving to move away from micro semantics, to overcome the narrow focus of semantic research on the analysis of individual units, and has turned to entire classes of words.

Comparative-historical linguistics, overcoming the contradictions and shortcomings of the neogrammar school, was significantly transformed in the second half of the 20th century. These changes were facilitated by such factors as the expansion of the empirical base (systematization of new data from ancient language monuments and taking into account modern non-written and early-written languages and dialects), the introduction of the principles of historicism and system analysis into the comparative historical methodology, the development and application of the method of internal reconstruction, the introduction into comparative -historical method of the principles of spatial localization, changing ideas about the parent language. The most important step in the development of comparative historical linguistics was the recognition of the need to involve the methods of structural methodology. Until the 1960s etymology, remaining on the periphery of the development of the science of language, “preserved” its methods practically in the state of the era of neogrammatism. As a way out of this situation, V.N. Toporov called for using the methods of structural linguistics in diachronic research. The basis for the structural approach in etymology is seen in the fact that each new word arises in a certain language system and is involved in relations with other elements of this system. Thus, etymological analysis should be subjected not to an isolated linguistic unit, but to units in the context of a certain “microsystem” in which it is included. V.N. Toporov determines the stratification of the history of different levels of the language system with the practical tasks of etymology in order to determine the structural changes that influenced the development of a particular lexical unit.

The consolidation of the methods of synchronic and diachronic analyzes and the creation of an integrative method of comparative historical linguistics takes place by the 80s. Consideration of the linguistic fact in two axes - synchrony and diachrony is recognized as fundamental. “Each fact of a language exists and can be understood in the system only when it is defined by two types of connections - connections with other elements of the system in which it enters at a given historical moment, and connections with previous and subsequent states of this fact itself”. Thus, the analysis of the systemic connections of the analyzed unit can occur only if they are analyzed within a certain historical stage in the development of the language.



The consideration of linguistic facts in the two axes of synchrony and diachrony was realized in the use of the method of "synchronous slices" of language in a comparative historical study. The "cut" of the language is some kind of linguistic abstraction, since the real temporal synchrony of linguistic facts is hardly established. The language system is dynamic: at a certain stage, it combines features both new, emerging, and dying. The language community is also not homogeneous; users of the same language belong to different generations and social groups. However, the method of synchronous slices demonstrates its effectiveness in the study of the language with a functional approach.

The sequential description of synchronic slices does not bring the study to the diachronic level. A prerequisite for diachronic analysis is the comparison of the linguistic facts of successive sections of the language. Diachronic analysis, carried out by gradually projecting one time slice onto another, makes it possible to identify the changing functional scope of changes, to identify archaic and innovative features. The main task of modern comparative historical research is to identify the direction and meaning of the ongoing changes.

The introduction of the principles of system analysis into the comparative-historical research methodology made it possible to expand the possibilities of comparative and internal reconstruction. External (comparative) reconstruction is carried out by comparing the elements of languages or dialects that go back to the same parent language. Combining the facts of various related languages can give a picture of the ancient linguistic state. External reconstruction makes it possible to determine the degree of archaism of certain linguistic features. Internal reconstruction is based on the data of one language. As already mentioned, the language system at a certain synchronous stage keeps traces of more ancient language states. Internal reconstruction is based on the principles of consistency and historicity of research, which is possible only on the material of one language system.

The involvement of structural techniques in comparative historical linguistics determined the priority of the method of internal reconstruction over the external one. It is the internal reconstruction that makes it possible to more strictly and objectively distinguish between archaisms and innovations and thereby chronologically stratify language categories. Internal reconstruction in modern diachronic research becomes a necessary basis for conducting a reasoned external reconstruction.

Until the middle of the XX century, there was a gap between etymological and semasiological tasks. An important step in the development of comparative historical linguistics was the involvement of semasiology. Back in 1945, V.V. Vinogradov. A separate linguistic unit, considered by the researcher in the dynamics of its development, is at the same time a part of the language system at every moment of its existence and is determined by the general context of this system. "The history of an individual word is not an accidental, but a consistent historical link in the general shifts of semantic systems, although many changes here can be caused by partial causes and not directly affect all elements of the language system. But the greater the danger, when studying the history of individual words, is to tear the fate of the word away from the living and changing concrete processes in the history of the language and distort the course of semantic changes". At the



end of the XX century the need to combine the etymological analysis of the unit with its historical-lexicological analysis seems obvious.

The semasiological aspect of the study of vocabulary, addressed to the analysis of the semantics of language units, allows a more detailed study of the representation of concepts in the minds of native speakers. The semasiological aspect of the study of vocabulary is especially relevant when referring to the categories of the speaker's consciousness (which has been observed in linguistics in recent decades). The semasiological description of the lexical system of the Russian language belongs to the works of many authors (A.P. Evgenyeva, O.N. Trubacheva, D.N. Shmelev, A.A. Ufimtseva, V.G. Gak, F.P. Filin, etc.) As you know, lexical semantics is a very changeable system, which is due to the need for an adequate description of the constantly changing extralinguistic situation. Lexical semantics is most susceptible to social and cultural-historical changes in society, therefore, on the one hand, its study should be carried out not only in the context of the state of the language at a certain stage, but also in the general cultural context. On the other hand, the study of semantic changes in the lexical system of a language, in turn, can provide valuable information about the spiritual and social development of an ethnic group.

The study of semantic change has long been neglected. Semantic changes seemed random, unpredictable and irrational. Later developed historical semasiology inherited the principles of historical phonology: semantic change was considered as the addition of a differential feature or its loss. The proto-meaning was thus considered as the lowest common denominator of the latest meanings, which is especially clearly presented in the etymological dictionary of the Indo-European language by Y. Pokorny. If we take such an etymology oriented towards differential semantic features, then the result of the Proto-Indo-European lexical composition will be unbelievably abstract. Very often, metaphorical semantic relations cannot be described as simply the addition of one differential feature or even a group of features; instead, a mapping from one area of knowledge to another must be described. If some feature is present in the meaning only in one of the related languages, this does not mean that this feature is a later innovation. Only a general theory of semantic change can inform us about which meanings still remain from the parent language and which were acquired later.

Historical semasiology is now also developing within the framework of the theory of semantic fields. These studies are often more successful in evaluating the relevant dimensions of meaning within a field, but fail to explain why polysemy and semantic change cause entire semantic fields to interact.

In the XX century comparative historical linguistics began to successfully use the methods developed by areal and typological linguistics. Areal linguistics is associated with a detailed study of dialects, which rewards with valuable information about the various states of sounds and forms in different territories. This allows the linguist to get a more complete picture of the language processes, to judge the nature of their distribution, helps to establish the relative chronology of the unit. For this work, the analysis of the areal characteristics of lexical units is of fundamental importance when considering their genetic relationships.



Thus, in general, the modern methodology of diachronic analysis has an integrative character and includes the methods of comparative historical, structural, areal, typological linguistics. The main methodological principles of modern diachronic research were developed in the works of E. Benveniste, V.N. Toporova, O.N. Trubacheva, Zh.Zh. Varbot et al.

REFERENCES:

1. Кузнецова А.И. Понятие семантической системы языка и методы ее исследования / А.И. Кузнецова. - М., 1963. - 59 с.
2. Blank A. Word and concept in time: toward diachronic cognitive onomasiology. [Electronic resource] / A. Blank // Metaforic.de. - URL.: <http://www.metaphorik.de/01/Blank.pdf>. (access date: 12.12.2013).
3. Kempson Ruth M. Semantic Theory / Ruth M. Kempson. - Cambridge, 1999. - P. 1-41, 76-101.
4. Jumamurodovna, C.M. 2022. Expression of the “Pride/Hubris Motif in English Literature. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION. 1, 4 (Oct. 2022), 81–83.
5. Akhmedova Mekhrinigor. The meaning of spirituality: different approaches and development of the word. Science and practice: a new level of integration in the modern world. 2018/4/28. - P.110-113
6. Muxlisa CHORIYEVA. Leksik-semantik maydonda “g’urur” modelining ifodalanishi. O’zbekiston milliy universiteti xabarlari. 2023/1/3/1.