

**DIACHRONIC APPROACHES TO THE STUDY CONVERSATION
(ORIGIN)**

Asqaraliyeva Aziza Uchqunbekovna,

Student of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages (Uzbekistan)

[*azizaasqaraliyeva@gmail.com*](mailto:azizaasqaraliyeva@gmail.com)

Supervisor: Kurbanov Muzaffar Abdumutalibovich,

Professor of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages (Uzbekistan)

Abstract: *The article investigates conversion as a means of forming new words without adding any derivative element when the basic form of the original and the basic derived words are homonymous having the same morphological structure, but belonging to different parts of speech. It is said that in the course of historical development grammatical forms in English were lost and there exists no inflection to distinguish the form of the verb from a noun and this is considered as widespread word formation in English. It also studies conversion being a type of word-building – not a pattern of structural relationship. Synchronically both types – a noun and a verb must be treated together as cases of patterned homonymy, while studying diachronically, it is essential to differentiate the cases of conversion and treat them separately. It is emphasized that it is not easy to say definitely which of the members was derived, the results of synchronic and diachronic analysis may not coincide. That means that what is understood under conversion in Modern English does not fully and necessarily coincide with earlier periods of the development of the language*

Keywords: *linguistics, semantic meaning, conversion, grammatical forms, syntactic functions, word formation, semantic relations, lexical.*

**ДИАХРОНИЧЕСКИЕ ПОДХОДЫ К УЧЕБНОМУ
РАЗГОВОРУ (ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИЕ)**



***Аннотация:** В статье исследуется преобразование как средство образования новых слов без добавления какого-либо производного элемента, когда основная форма исходного и базового производных слов являются омонимичными, имеющими одинаковую морфологическую структуру, но принадлежащими разным частям речи. Говорят, что в ходе исторического развития грамматические формы в английском языке были утеряны и не существует флексии, позволяющей отличить форму глагола от существительного, и это считается широко распространенным словообразованием в английском языке. Он также изучает конверсию как тип словообразования, а не как образец структурных отношений. Синхронно оба типа - существительное и глагол - должны рассматриваться вместе как случаи шаблонной омонимии, при диахроническом изучении важно различать случаи преобразования и рассматривать их отдельно. Подчеркивается, что однозначно сказать, какой из членов был выведен, непросто, результаты синхронного и диахронического анализа могут не совпадать. Это означает, что то, что понимается под преобразованием в современном английском, не полностью и не обязательно совпадает с более ранними периодами развития языка.*

***Ключевые слова:** лингвистика, семантическое значение, преобразование, грамматические формы, синтаксические функции, словообразование, семантические отношения, лексика .*

INTRODUCTION

The general agreement on higher scientific productivity of research based on the integrated cognitive-and-discursive approach is overshadowed by a discussion about period of discourse studies. The discourse is usually defined as a model of online language usage, which means time and space limitation of the speech activity associated with a certain type of social reality and verbal behavior [1, p. 137; 20; 38].

However, in the works of E.S. Kubryakova [25, p. 525–526], an alternative argumentation was given, it motivates the possibility of referring methods and tools of cognitive-and discursive analysis to discourse in historical perspective:



«Discourse is a creation of a certain time period» [25, p. 526]. Fully supporting this statement, we consider that any type of social activity is historically dependent; it is mirrored in discourse practice that absorbs social and cultural imprints and represents them in language signs chosen by a person to build texts and make them discourse products. It allows us to take up linguistic studies of a group of texts (text family) that perform common functions in communicative situations and reflect a definite cultural and historical period in the evolution of a certain type of discourse. Analyzing linguistic representations of discourse categories in a text family researchers may not only disclose facts and events from national history, collect information on phonomorphological, lexical, and grammatical features of the language at different periods, but also reconstruct the first threats of text type formation, observe realizations of text categories in historical perspective, distinguish vectors of discourse evolution in later stages of textual culture development.

The purpose of this paper is to briefly explore and summarize the main achievements of Western discourse analysis oriented at a historical approach and give a comprehensive picture of studies in Russian schools of historical linguistics that have various overtones and nuances with the accent on diachronically oriented discourse analysis.

Considering the text to be a core constituent of discourse, linguists introduced a historical perspective in its description. In European and American linguistics it was not until the middle 1990s' when historical linguists had reached well beyond the sentence boundary, thus switching with some delay from studies of the language system to research of language-in-use [18].

METHODS

Linguists working in the field mainly do it within two subfields. Firstly, we will point to historical pragmatics, a brunch exploring the evolution of pragmatic functions of language units in two directions:

1) from function to form, when changes in language mean employed in functional units (speech acts) are studied;



2) from form to function, when changes in the functional load and/or functional repertoire of separate linguistic units are registered.

In fact, this trend is often viewed as a discourse-oriented historical linguistics, the aim of which is to study pragmatic factors that influence historical language changes in the text; discursive motivations are the focus of studies at any level of language – phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic [19].

Secondly, historical discourse linguistics is distinguished [4], it employs various methodological approaches of historical linguistics but also uses its own set of research tools for getting new goals and objectives while studying language recourses and text peculiarities in a historical perspective, that is in a defined period. It should be stated that historical discourse linguists deal mainly with texts of past periods (historical texts, documents, and chronicles); they describe language and text peculiarities on a synchronic layer [5].

In Western linguistics the following subdivision of the latter field is suggested: historical discourse analysis proper, diachronic (ally-oriented) discourse analysis, and diachronic discourse analysis [3, p. 139, 140], which clearly shows differences in approaches to studies.

The first one is synchronically oriented studies of texts of past periods such as chronicles, documents, and historical texts to discover their linguistic peculiarities at a certain period.

The second one is focused on discourse functions, text categories, and their language realizations from a historical perspective. The major goal of this subfield is to describe and register the development of an entire discourse domain, which requires extensive knowledge of the inventories of text types and genres at different points in the history of language culture, and this – in turn – requires detailed knowledge of specific historical text types [23].

At this point, researchers enter the subfields of diachronically-oriented text linguistics or text-oriented historical linguistics. The former aims to study text types and genres as the process of formation and evolution. Scholars working within the framework of this approach make attempts to identify the repertoire of genres in

some historical periods and describe oral and written genres as well as the transformation process of oral genres into written ones.

RESULTS

Researchers engaged in this subfield as a rule trace the evolution of individual genres or text types (see, e.g. [13]). The latter sets the goal to study the impact of texts, genres, and discourses on the process of language change [23]. T. Köhnen sets the main objectives of this subfield as follows:

- 1) description of texts and genres created in past historical periods,
- 2) identification of formal and functional language changes in texts and genres that are needed to implement the communicative function at a certain time period,
- 3) showing how a change like the text functional profile affects the employed linguistic resources from a historical perspective.

According to the goal of the research, there was performed part speech analysis of English monepic phonetic terminology in the diachronic aspect. The percentage of phonetic terms expressed by different parts of speech, particularly, by nouns, adjectives, and verbs with consideration of the chronological periodization is shown in the table below.

Table. Parts of speech analysis of the English phonetic terminology

Period	Total amount of terms	Terminology, expressed by		
		nouns (S)	adjectives (A)	verbs (V)
X-XII century	75 (100%)	54 (72%)	14 (18,66%)	7 (9,33%)
XIII century	40 (100%)	28 (70%)	5 (12,5%)	7 (17,5%)
XIV century	131 (100%)	90 (68,7%)	20 (15,26%)	21 (16,03%)
XV century	65 (100%)	43 (66,15%)	12 (18,46%)	10 (15,38%)
XVI century	179 (100%)	128 (71,5%)	33 (18,43%)	18 (10,05%)
XVII century	162 (100%)	95 (58,64%)	50 (30,86%)	17 (10,49%)
XVIII century	80 (100%)	45 (56,25%)	25 (31,25%)	10 (12,5%)
XIX century	206 (100%)	131 (63,59%)	55 (26,69%)	20 (9,7%)
XX century	319 (100%)	167 (52,35%)	139 (43,57%)	13 (4,07%)



Total	1257 (100%)	781 (62,13 %)	353 (28,08 %)	123 (9,78 %)
--------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------

As it is seen in the table, during the period of X-XIII centuries, the main part of the English terminological body (on average 70%) is represented by terms-nouns. The segment of terms-adjectives is consequently 12-18%, and the segment of terms-verbs is 9-17%. From XIV to XVI centuries, the segment of terms-nouns almost did not change and composed on average 68-71% of the total number of terms of this chronological interval. As it is represented, this denotes the stabilization of the number of objects of research in this field of science and the limited set of integral qualities during the described period. Circumstantially, these characteristics can witness the lack of dynamics in the development of the science of phonetics (more correctly (orthoepy) in this chronological interval.

Examples of nouns in the terminology of this period:

XIV century – accent (Maruzo, 368; Trahterov, 12; Matthews, 4), closure (Maruzo, 370; Trahterov, 47; Matthews, 57), mutation (Maruzo, 377; Trahterov, 182; Matthews, 236), uvula (Trahterov, 297; Matthews, 393).

XV century – articulation (Maruzo, 369; Trahterov, 25; Matthews, 26), curve (Trahterov, 55), pause (Maruzo, 378; Trahterov, 209; Matthews, 270), slope (Trahterov, 259).

XVI century – audition (Trahterov, 29), cavity (Trahterov, 42; Matthews, 49), elision (Maruzo, 372; Trahterov, 74; Matthews, 111), glottis (Maruzo, 374; Trahterov, 103; Matthews, 147).

In the period XIV to XVI centuries, it is noted some kind of increase in the segment of terms-adjectives as part of the terminological body on the average from 15 to 18%, which, undoubtedly, is related to the increasing need for terminological nomination in connection with the development of scientific knowledge and expansion of the set of objects of research and their main features.

Examples of adjectives in the terminology of this period:

XIV century – acute (Maruzo, 368; Trahterov, 14), coronal (Maruzo, 371; Trahterov, 54), liquid (Maruzo, 376; Trahterov, 154), pliant (Trahterov, 220).



XV century – concave (Trahterov, 150), diphthongal (Trahterov, 65), dorsal (Maruzo, 372; Trahterov, 68; Matthews, 104), hoarse (Trahterov, 117).

XVI century – audible (Trahterov, 29), convex (Trahterov, 153), neutral (Maruzo, 377; Matthews, 242).

The segment of terms-verbs in the period from XIV to XVI centuries composed on the average from 10 to 16%, at that, there is observed a tendency to some decrease of their segment in the total amount of terminological units. It should be noted that the most terms-verbs, in percent, about the total amount of the exposed terminology are documented in the period from XIII to XV centuries (on the average 15-17%) when the necessity to nominate actions grew wider, performed by orthoepists and phonetists as well as actions, characterizing behavior of objects of orthoepy and phonetics.

Examples of verbs in the terminology of this period:

XIII century – descend (Trahterov, 60), overlap (Trahterov, 203), release (Trahterov, 242), remove (Trahterov, 242).

XIV century – exhale (Trahterov, 82), expire (Trahterov, 82), hiss (Trahterov, 117), inspire (Trahterov, 128).

XV century – assimilate (Trahterov, 27), block (Trahterov, 35), intone (Trahterov, 135), recede (Trahterov, 239).

In the centuries XVII-XIX the segment of terms-adjectives increases on the average up to 30%, and the segment of terms-nouns decreases and composes on the average from 56 to 63%.

Examples of nouns in the terminology of this period:

XVII century – accommodation (Maruzo, 368; Trahterov, 13; Matthews, 5), apex (Trahterov, 22), epiglottis (Maruzo, 372; Trahterov, 79), suction (Trahterov, 274; Matthews, 362).

XVIII century – alveolus (Trahterov, 19), dorsum (Trahterov, 69; Matthews, 104), syllabication (Maruzo, 381; Trahterov, 277), velum (Maruzo, 382; Trahterov, 301; Matthews, 395).



XIX century – ablaut (Trahterov, 10; Matthews, 2), dentalization (Trahterov, 59), loudness (Trahterov, 159; Matthews, 213), nasalization (Maruzo, 377; Trahterov, 189; Matthews, 238).

Examples of adjectives in the terminology of this period:

XVII century – accentual (Trahterov, 12), epiglottal (Trahterov, 78; Matthews, 115), mandibular (Trahterov, 164), nasal (Maruzo, 377; Trahterov, 186).

XVIII century – alveolar (Trahterov, 18; Matthews, 15), consonantal (Trahterov, 51; Matthews, 70), laryngeal (Maruzo, 375; Trahterov, 145; Matthews, 200), velar (Maruzo, 382; Trahterov, 299; Matthews, 395).

XIX century – apical (Maruzo, 369; Trahterov, 23; Matthews, 21), glottal (Maruzo, 373; Trahterov, 102; Matthews, 147), palatal (Maruzo, 377; Trahterov, 204; Matthews, 262), spirant (Maruzo, 380; Trahterov, 265; Matthews, 350).

The amount of term-verbs in the period of from XVII to XIX centuries is more stable in comparison with other parts of speech and varies within the interval of from 10 to 12%, accordingly. This stable amount of terms-verbs can be explained by the fact that the set of actions, performed by both researchers in the sphere of phonetics and phonology and objects of these fields of knowledge, has a limited and repeated character.

Examples of verbs in the terminology of this period:

XVII century – catenate (Trahterov, 42), emit (Trahterov, 75), flatten (Trahterov, 89), obstruct (Trahterov, 195).

XVIII century – accentuate (Trahterov, 12), constrict (Trahterov, 51), inhale (Trahterov, 127), intonate (Trahterov, 133).

XIX century – dentalize (Trahterov, 59), labialize (Trahterov, 144), mutate (Trahterov, 182), phonate (Trahterov, 213).

In the XX century, there is documented a kind of decrease in the number of terms-nouns, accompanied by a pronounced increase in the segment of terms-adjectives. So, in the XX century, the segment of terms-nouns composed on an average 52% of from the total amount of involved terms, the segment of terms-



adjectives, accordingly, composes about 43%, and the segment of terms-verbs – about 4%.

Examples of nouns in the terminology of this period: are adaptability (Trahterov, 15), coalescence (Maruzo, 370; Trahterov, 47), debuccalization (Crystal, 124), and feedback (Crystal, 178).

Examples of adjectives in the terminology of this period: are approximant (Crystal, 30), diaphonic (Trahterov, 63), frictionless (Trahterov, 93), and junctural (Crystal, 248).

Examples of verbs in the terminology of this period: are mispronounce (Trahterov, 176), monotonize (Trahterov, 179), resonate (Crystal, 397), notice (Trahterov, 315).

DISCUSSION

The considerable increase in the segment of terms-adjectives in the XX century can be explained by the further development of science, the appearance of new scientific fields, and the necessity to nominate new notions not exist before. An increase in the number of adjectives derives from the background of increasing the amount of compound terminology (term-groups), which allows the conclusion that terms-adjectives, having featuring nominatives, play the role of "building material" for compound terminology.

The segment of terms-nouns in the described period slightly decreases generally remaining stable during several chronological periods, which shows the formedness of terminology, nominating the main realities of phonetics and phonology.

The analysis of the proportion of terms expressed by different parts of speech makes it possible to conclude that terms-nouns compose the basis of the terminological body of English phonetics at all stages of its development (62% from the total amount of research counting 2465 terminological units), which lends evidence of the special status of this part of speech, maximally expressing one of the main functions of the term, namely, nominative function.

REFERENCES:



1. Arutyunova N.D. Discourse. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. 1990, pp. 136-137.
2. Beal J., Corrigan K., Moisl H. Creating and Digitizing Language Corpora, Diachronic Databases. Houndmills, Palgrave, 2007. 250 p.
3. Brinton L.J. Historical discourse analysis. In: Schiffrin D., Tannen D., Hamilton H.E., eds. The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford, Blackwell, 2001, pp. 138-160.
4. Carroll R., Hiltunen R., Peikola M., Skaffari J., Tanskanen S-K., Valle, E., Wervik B. Introduction. In: Hiltunen R., Skaffari J., eds. Discourse Perspectives on English: Medieval to Modern (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 119). Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2003, pp. 1-12.
5. Collins D. Speech reporting and the suppression of orality in seventeenth-century Russian trial dossiers. Historical Courtroom Discourse. Special issue of Journal of Historical Pragmatics, 2006, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 265-292.
6. Van Dijk T. Language. Knowledge. Communication. Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1989. 312 p.
7. Demyankov V.Z. Cognitivism, Cognition, Language and Linguistic Theory. Language and Structure of Knowledge Presentation. Moscow, INION RAN Publishers, 1991, pp. 39-77.
8. Dmitrieva E.G. Composition Properties and Lexical Peculiarities of Formal Replies of the early 17th Century. Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics, 2016, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 81-88. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2016.2.10>.
9. Ishanjanova, M. S. (2021). DEIXIS AS AN ASPECT OF PRAGMATICS. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 2(2), 239-245.
10. Munosib, I., & Madina, A. (2023). Linguaculturology: Exploring The Interplay Of Language And Culture. *Fan, Jamiyat Va Innovatsiyalar*, 1(2), 19-21.