



THE ROLE OF CULTURAL FACTORS AND TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGES

Kuldasheva Shakhnoza Akramovna

Uzbek State University of World Languages

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences

Article history:	Abstract:
Received: 6 th February 2025 Accepted: 4 th March 2025	<p>The present article is devoted to the study of the coverage in scientific literature of one of the most pressing problems of linguistics – the role and significance of the principle of historicity in linguistic research. Naturally, this includes such issues as the nature, types and scale of changes in language, as well as the impact of these changes on the expansion or narrowing of the functional aspects of language.</p> <p>The article shows the reasons for these negative trends observed in the history of linguistics, the main manifestations of anthropocentrism, as well as how failure to comply with the principle of historicity in the study of languages, errors in the application of its principles and insufficient understanding of it can hinder the correct assessment of the essence and patterns of language development.</p>

Keywords: Principle of historicism, historical category, ethnogenetic research, history of language, history of society.

The 21st century, the century of globalism, has had a huge impact on public consciousness, thinking and worldview of people. In this context, the development of international relations has sharply increased their interest in history and language. In this situation, it is natural that along with positive thoughts, views and theories, there will also be ideologically harmful ideas and views that incorrectly reflect the history of languages and peoples. In this article, we decided to examine the role and significance of the principle of historicity in the study of languages as comprehensively and systematically as possible in order to eliminate various errors made in the process of studying the history of languages and peoples.

To understand a language properly, it is necessary to study its history and consider it from a diachronic point of view. Because the state of a language today will become history tomorrow. Native speakers do not notice the changes that occur in their language. Every year, hundreds of words enter circulation, and hundreds more leave it and become passive vocabulary, ballast. The process of nominating candidates itself is carried out on a historical basis. For example, the meanings of words change from time to time: new meanings appear and old ones disappear. This is diachrony within synchrony. This shows that language is inherently more complex than we think. It is impossible to know the present and future of a language without knowing its history. [1]

The Germanic group of languages, one of the largest groups of the Indo-European language family, is one of the most investigated language groups in the world linguistics. If a language group has been thoroughly studied, it might seem that there are no unsolved problems left. But in practice, this is not the case. Many of the conclusions made by comparative-historical linguists, and later structuralists in the 19th and 20th centuries, have become outdated in one way or another by the 21st century and have become obstacles to the further development of linguistics. Therefore, a system-based approach required a revision of some previous conclusions.

The existence of Germanic languages in antiquity, their contacts with other language groups and families, their history and the latest achievements of archaeology were applied to their study, which led to the need to revise some assumptions in linguistics, including those about the Huns, their language, which is one of the oldest Turkic languages, and their role in the formation of European languages. [2]

The Huns were a Turkic-speaking people, the first written sources about them date back to the 3rd century BC. In the 1st century BC, the Huns began migrating west, and 300 years later, having united many tribes, they formed a tribal union and reached the territories of Central Europe. This marked the beginning of the Great Migration of Peoples, which took place in Europe in the 3rd–8th centuries AD. [3]

Information about the Hunnic language is contained in the form of names, elementary texts and



some bilingual glosses preserved in written monuments of Eastern and Central Europe, Altai, Northern China, Eastern Turkestan and other regions, the study of which provides certain information about the Hunnic language. As is known, Ferdinand de Saussure is one of the greatest scientists in the field of world linguistics and is considered the founder of structural linguistics. Despite the fact that he was the founder of structuralism, he was also a brilliant comparativist. His works on the analysis of the structure of the syllable and related phenomena in Indo-European languages have not lost their significance in linguistics. At a time when the issue of the purity of linguistic analysis and the attitude to comparative-historical linguistics was on the agenda, vulgarization and folk etymology allowed by linguists were still used in linguistic analysis. To improve the current situation in modern linguistics of the 21st century, the ideas and scientific recommendations of F. de Saussure on what a truly scientific analysis should have remained relevant.

The immanent nature of linguistic change does not so much reflect its various external influences, be they social, geographical or psychological. In the "Rational Grammar", developed in the monastery of Port-Royal in 1660, for the first time in the history of linguistic science, the existence of interrelations and connections between grammar and logic was theoretically substantiated. It is obvious that ancient linguistics, including the Port-Royal grammar, also carried out a synchronic analysis of language, that is, an analysis of a certain period. The division of language into parts, units, the history of words or other units, or rather the study of the history of language, was not yet defined as the goal of science, since the science of language was not yet sufficiently formed. The fact that language is a changing historical category was accepted as a basic concept and principle only in the era of comparative-historical linguistics. This was a new approach to the study of language, which allowed us to give new, accurate and truthful explanations of many things that had not been explained before, and to get a correct idea of the development of language. This does not mean that the principle of historicity is observed only in comparative-historical linguistics. Scientific analysis of language in all existing schools and directions cannot be carried out without a historical basis. The study of all units of language - phonemes, morphemes, words, phrases or statements - is described in historical science taking into account the history of a specific language and with the help of this history. The application of this principle remained a necessary condition for analysis

even when it came to a certain static state of language. At present, the science has introduced concepts of history in a certain period or history not associated with any period, going beyond the basic concepts of diachronic linguistics: time, period and history. [4]

Thus, the scientific study of the history of languages arose in the first quarter of the 19th century. This became possible due to the comparison of various language materials in order to identify historical similarities, common features or differences between them. Of course, comparisons of languages were made earlier, but unrelated languages were used for comparison, which did not allow any logical conclusions to be drawn from this comparison, or anything to be generalized or systematized. Moreover, not only vocabulary, not only basic vocabulary, but even commonly accepted words were taken as objects of comparison. The grammatical structure of languages remained outside the scope of comparative study. Such a comparison, which has no historical basis, will not bring any benefit to the study of the history of language. What is important for linguistics is not just comparisons, but comparisons based on history and conducted for the purpose of studying history.

LITERATURE

1. Абаев В.И. Об историзме в описательном языкознании. О соотношении синхронного анализа и исторического изучения языков. - М.; Изд. Наука, 1960. – 240 с.
2. Мapp. Н. Я. Избранные труды по языкознанию. - М.: Наука, 1948. - 450 с.
3. Kuldashv, A. M., & Kuldashva, S. A. (2021). On the nature of changes in Germanic languages under the influence of the great migration of peoples. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (96), 325-331. Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-96-65> Doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.04.96.65>
4. Qo'ldashev A.M. Tilshunoslikda tarixiylik tamoyili. – Toshkent; Fan, 2020. – 300 b.