

## ON THE ISSUE OF DIACHRONIC TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES

Ergasheva Asal Erkinovna

Lecturer, Department of Russian Language Tashkent City Branch of the Gubkin  
Russian State University (National Research University) of Oil and Gas in Tashkent  
ergashevaasalxon20@gmail.com

### Abstract

This article examines the problem of the relationship between synchronic and diachronic approaches to language analysis, emphasizing their complementary nature. Contemporary achievements in semantics and cognitive linguistics, which are based on the influence of cognitive factors on the semantic development of words, raise important questions about how to integrate these approaches for a deeper understanding of linguistic processes. This work proposes overcoming one-sidedness in the training of linguists in higher education to more fully consider both aspects—synchrony and diachrony—in language analysis. Special attention is given to interdisciplinary methods that allow for the combination of synchronic analysis of linguistic structures with diachronic study of their historical development. Such an approach helps form a comprehensive understanding of language as a dynamic system, accounting for both its current states and historical changes, which, in turn, can enrich the educational process and improve the quality of training specialists in linguistics.

**Keywords:** Theoretical linguistics, semantics, synchronic research, diachronic research, dichotomy, language universals, borrowings, grammatical categories, comparative linguistics.

### Introduction

Language, like other phenomena of reality, does not remain static but changes and evolves. From its inception, theoretical linguistics has engaged with the processes of language change and development. Language change is noted for its clear contradictions: according to V. A. Grechko, to understand the specific causes behind changes in certain linguistic phenomena, it is essential to examine the history of these phenomena and study their interrelations and dependencies within the language system from both synchronic and diachronic perspectives. It is crucial to explore these interrelations and dependencies in the language system synchronically and diachronically.

### LITERATURE AND METHODOLOGY

The founder of the theory of synchronic and diachronic study was F. Saussure. According to Saussure, it is essential for a science dealing with the concept of meaning to distinguish between two-time axes. For linguistics, this division of time axes—synchronic and diachronic—is absolute, "since language is a system of pure signifiers defined exclusively by the current state of its components." Saussure differentiates two types of linguistics depending on the distribution of the axes of synchrony (simultaneity) and diachrony (sequence): synchronic



(static) linguistics and diachronic (evolutionary) linguistics. Synchronic linguistics should deal with the logical and psychological relations that connect coexisting elements to form a system and study them as perceived by a single collective consciousness. Diachronic linguistics, by contrast, should study the relations between elements that follow one another over time and are not perceived by the same collective consciousness, meaning elements that succeed each other continuously and do not form a single system.

## RESULTS

We believe that regardless of the extent to which language develops, fundamental basic structures can always be identified. Following E. S. Kubryakova, we believe that “historical factors must dominate in the formation of categories in natural languages, and the best representatives of categories are often their historically earlier forms.” In our case, however, it is precisely the data obtained at the synchronic level that encourages us to seek answers to the question, “Why are languages (grammatical categories) structured in this particular way?”

## DISCUSSION

Our study considers it advisable to use data from cognitively oriented typology, where “language and linguistic activity are, in essence, the most direct product of cognitive activity and can be viewed as a starting point for its reconstruction.” According to E. S. Kubryakova, “all linguistic phenomena should be studied not only from a structural-semantic point of view, not only from a purely formal one, but also in terms of their role in the production of text and discourse.” Kubryakova bases this on the idea that “language performs two main functions—recognition/representation and communication (discourse), with both recognition and communication equally determining the specifics of language and its structure.”

## CONCLUSION

Diachronic typological studies play a crucial role in understanding the evolutionary processes that occur in language. By analyzing changes in grammatical and phonetic systems, the causes of these changes, and general typological trends, it can be concluded that languages develop according to universal laws that define their typological structure. Integrating the diachronic approach into typological studies allows not only to trace the evolutionary paths of language development but also to deepen our understanding of the mechanisms of linguistic variability.

## REFERENCES

1. Benveniste, E. (1976). *The Origin of Language and Linguistics*. Moscow: Nauka.
2. Grebenshchikov, V. N. (2015). *Diachronic Typology: Methodology and Practice*. St. Petersburg: RGPU Publishing.
3. Zalevskaya, A. A. (2004). *Typological Linguistics: Issues and Perspectives*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture.
4. Kostromina, I. V. (2018). Language Changes and Their Typology: Historical Aspects. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 9: Philology*, 3, 17–28.
5. Kubryakova, E. S. (2004). *Language and Knowledge: Towards Understanding the Nature of Parts of Speech from a Cognitive Perspective*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture.



6. Levina, N. B. (2019). Comparative Typology: From Synchrony to Diachrony. *Linguistic Analysis*, 14(1), 45–60.
7. Martynenko, A. P. (2020). *Historical Grammar and Diachrony in Modern Linguistics*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
8. Nikolaeva, T. M. (2008). *Non-Paradigmatic Linguistics*. Moscow.
9. Solovyova, T. S. (2017). Language Changes in a Historical Perspective: A Typological Approach. *Journal of Typological Linguistics*, 6(2), 89–105.
10. Tikhomirov, A. I. (2016). Typology and Diachrony: Methodological Aspects of Research. *Linguistic Studies*, 5(4), 123–135.
11. Saussure, F. (1999). *Course in General Linguistics*. Ural University Press.
- Shevchenko, V. P. (2014). *A Brief Course in Comparative Linguistics*. Moscow: Higher School.

