

The Evolution of Linguistic Terminology in English, Uzbek, And Karakalpak: A Comparative Historical Analysis

Koshanova Sakhibjamal Bakhitbaevna

Doctoral Student, Karakalpak State University, Nukus, Uzbekistan

Received: 15 March 2026; **Accepted:** 03 April 2026; **Published:** 29 April 2026

Abstract: This research explores the historical emergence of linguistic terminology in three languages—English, Uzbek, and Karakalpak—with special attention to the role of Latin, Greek, and Arabic heritage. It traces how borrowed concepts were nativized and localized in each linguistic setting. By juxtaposing five evolutionary stages in English with analogous processes in Uzbek and Karakalpak, the paper illustrates the interplay between international scholarly traditions and indigenous linguistic norms. The conclusions highlight both universal tendencies and language-specific particularities in the growth of terminological systems.

Keywords: Linguistic terminology; diachronic analysis; English; Uzbek; Karakalpak; borrowing; adaptation; localization; comparative linguistics; language history.

Introduction: Linguistic terminology in any language emerges concomitantly with the institutionalization and advancement of linguistic science itself. The terms of this domain constitute a crucial instrument for the scholarly investigation, classification, description, and theoretical substantiation of language phenomena. The evolution of such terminology in each national language is determined by a constellation of historical, sociocultural, and scientific factors. As L. Yu. Buyanova observes: "...the formation and development of the terminological system of each field are inextricably linked with the very establishment and subsequent evolution of that field, thereby acquiring a sector-specific character." [1; 19].

Accordingly, the formation of linguistic terminology in English, Uzbek, and Karakalpak follows its own developmental trajectory, underpinned by distinctive historical-genetic foundations. Within this chapter, particular attention is devoted to the emergence of linguistic terms in the three languages under comparison, including their lexical-semantic transformations, diachronic shifts, and etymological characteristics.

Diachrony refers to an analytical approach concerned

with the historical development and internal change of a language over time. In linguistic research, such an approach permits a comprehensive examination of the origins, historical transformations, and stages of consolidation of linguistic terms. From a comparative linguistic perspective, our analysis seeks to determine the sources upon which the linguistic terminologies of the three languages are based, to trace the hierarchical stages through which they evolved, and to elucidate the processes of adoption, naturalization, and localization (adaptation to the national language) of disciplinary terms.

Furthermore, the chapter highlights the interplay of linguistic and extralinguistic factors, traditions, and salient linguistic features that have shaped the formation of linguistic terminology in each language. The development of linguistic terminology in English, in particular, may be conventionally divided into the following five historical periods:

1. The Old English period;
2. The Medieval period;
3. The Early Modern period (17th-19th centuries);
4. The Modern period – institutionalization of

linguistic science (19th-20th centuries);

5. The Contemporary period – globalization and emerging paradigms.

The emergence of linguistic terminology in English in fact dates back to antiquity, that is, to the earliest periods of the language. Historical sources testify that the formation of linguistic terms may be traced to the origins of human society itself. Old English (also called Anglo-Saxon), spoken in Britain between the 5th and 11th centuries CE, was a language of Germanic origin. It differed fundamentally from Present-Day English in its structure, lexical inventory, and morphological characteristics. Old English linguistic terms, therefore, constitute an important source for the study of the history of linguistics, etymology, and semantic change in this period. It is recorded that Old English was divided into four principal dialects: Northumbrian, Mercian, West Saxon, and Kentish. Among these, the West Saxon dialect predominates in written sources, and it is primarily through this dialect that linguists conduct historical and philological analyses [2; 178].

Although the modern concept of the "term" had not yet taken shape in Old English, a number of words and expressions pertaining to the structure of language can nevertheless be identified. These may be provisionally grouped into the following categories. Particularly noteworthy are phonetic and orthographic elements. Old English employed special symbols to represent specific phonemes, including:

- þ (thorn) and ð (eth) to represent the "th" sound;
- p (wynn) for the "w" sound;
- æ (ash) as a ligature of "a" and "e." [3; 56].

These characters are crucial for understanding phonetic changes. For example, the phoneme þ in þæt (modern that) is now represented as "th." [4; 67].

From a morphological standpoint, Old English was a fusional (or inflectional) rather than an agglutinative language, encoding grammatical information through affixes. Illustrative examples include:

- Inflectional morphemes used to indicate number, gender, and case for nouns, verbs, and adjectives.
- Typical case endings included *-es* (genitive), *-um* (dative), and *-as* (plural).
- Example: stān ("stone") – nominative singular; stānes – genitive singular ("of the stone"). [5; 234]

It should be emphasized that Old English lacked a fully standardized syntactic system comparable to later stages of the language. Nevertheless, certain elements are treated as proto-terms in linguistic theory, for

example:

- beon/weisan – copular verbs "to be";
- þā/þæt/seo – articles/demonstratives functioning as markers of number and gender;
- seolfa – "self," used reflexively. [6; ibid]

A number of historical and sociocultural factors influenced the emergence of linguistic terminology in Old English. Among the most significant were the following:

- The spread of Christianity. Beginning in the seventh century, monastic schools were established in Britain, where grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics were taught. In these settings, Latin linguistic concepts were translated and gradually assimilated into the local language.
- The influence of Latin. Concepts such as terminus grammaticus, oratio, declinatio, and coniugatio entered Anglo-Saxon from Latin sources.
- The works of Ælfric. The Anglo-Saxon author Ælfric (7th-8th centuries) composed works such as Grammar and Glossary, in which he attempted to render Latin grammatical concepts in Anglo-Saxon. For instance, "Se stæf is an letter" ("The letter is a character"). [8;129]

The linguistic terms that existed in Old English thus laid the earliest foundations for modern linguistic scholarship. Through them it is possible to gain deeper insight into processes of historical and gradual change in the language, the formation of grammatical systems, and lexical evolution. Words such as sprec, writan, and stæf in Old English reveal the roots of many fundamental linguistic terms in present-day English. Likewise, the active philological work of figures such as Ælfric and Bede laid the groundwork for later grammatical theories.

Analysis of primary sources reveals that English linguistic terminology arose largely on the basis of Latin and Greek materials. The earliest grammars were composed in Latin, and the structure of Anglo-Saxon was described with reference to that language. [9; 46]. Consequently, a significant portion of English linguistic terms are lexical borrowings from Greek and Latin. For example, the term phonology derives from the Greek phōnē ("sound") and logos ("study"). This word first appeared in the late nineteenth century and became widely disseminated in the twentieth century under the influence of structuralism.

It should also be noted that the development of linguistic terminology in English was subsequently shaped by European scholarly traditions more broadly. Beyond the Old English period, English linguistic terminology passed through the following evolutionary

stages:

The Medieval period. In the Middle Ages, all branches of learning in Europe (including grammar) were taught in Latin. For this reason, the earliest English linguistic terms – noun, verb, adjective, grammar, and others – entered the language in Latin or Greek forms. For instance, grammar came into English via French from Latin, ultimately deriving from the Greek *grammatike* ("the art of writing"). Similarly, noun originates from Latin *nomen* ("name"), and verb from Latin *verbum* ("word"). It may therefore be concluded that the earliest grammatical terms in English were firmly rooted in traditional Latin-Greek sources. [10; 97].

The Early Modern Period – Emergence of Grammar Works in the Vernacular (17th-19th Centuries). By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, interest in the structure of English began to grow, and works on English grammar started to appear. Although Latin forms of terminology still predominated at this stage, the publication of the first grammar books written in English initiated attempts to render technical terms in the vernacular. For example, when William Bullokar produced the first grammar of English in 1586, he employed Latin grammatical terms such as masculine, feminine, noun, verb, and others, but simultaneously attempted to explain certain concepts in English. In the eighteenth century, grammar books by authors such as Lindley Murray made grammar more accessible to the general public, using clearer language while retaining the Latin-French forms of specialist terms. This persistence reflected a firmly established tradition within European scholarship.

The Modern Period – The Institutionalization of Linguistics (19th-20th Centuries). By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, linguistics emerged as an autonomous discipline, accompanied by the coining of new terms. For instance, the concept of the phoneme was introduced by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay [11;167] and further developed by Czech scholars before being adopted into French and English. The English term phoneme, borrowed from French *phonème* in the 1930s, is now one of the discipline's core concepts. Similarly, terms such as morpheme, semantics, and syntax entered scientific circulation during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and became firmly established as technical terms in English. Most of these terms, rooted in Greek and Latin, rapidly became part of the international scientific lexicon.

The Contemporary Period – Globalization and Emerging Paradigms. Today English functions as the principal language of international scientific communication, and its linguistic terminology continues to expand and diversify. New subfields of linguistics – such as

computational linguistics, corpus linguistics, neurolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and pragmalinguistics – have generated corresponding neologisms, enriching the English linguistic lexicon. At the same time, a steady stream of English linguistic terms has been borrowed into other languages.

On the basis of the sources examined, it can be concluded that the formation of linguistic terminology in English has unfolded over centuries within the framework of European scholarly tradition. Whereas the earliest terms derived from classical Latin and Greek, English itself has gradually become a language of science. Today English linguistic terminology constitutes an integral part of the global lexical stock and may be regarded as one stratum of the internationally accepted system of terms.

Comparative analysis undertaken in this study demonstrates that in typologically different languages the same linguistic concepts can be expressed through distinct terminological systems. These differences stem, on the one hand, from the historical sources that have influenced each language (Latin, Arabic, Turkic, etc.), and on the other hand from each nation's linguistic self-concept. Terminology thus serves not only scientific purposes but also contributes to the preservation and development of a nation's linguistic and cultural heritage.

In this respect, the development of linguistic terminology in English, Uzbek, and Karakalpak mirrors their historical evolution and their specific national and cultural interconnections. English has achieved international prominence through its systematic borrowing of scientific terms from other languages and, conversely, by exporting its own lexical units worldwide. Uzbek has enriched its terminology by translating concepts into the national language and adapting them to its own linguistic norms, while also absorbing international terms under Russian influence. Karakalpak, meanwhile, has effectively drawn on the experience of its closely related Kazakh and Uzbek counterparts, developing a compact and distinctive terminological system of its own.

REFERENCES

1. Бунова Л.Ю. Терминологическая деривация в современном русском языке (метаязыковой аспект). Краснодар, 1996. С. 19. (in Russian)
2. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. 2010. Cambridge University Press. P. 178.
3. Baker P. S. Introduction to Old English. 2003. Blackwell Publishing. P. 56.
4. Durkin P. Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords

- in English. 2014. Oxford University Press. P. 67.
5. Cameron A. Dictionary of Old English: A to G Online. 1993. University of Toronto Press. P. 234.
 6. Cameron A. Dictionary of Old English: A to G Online. 1993. University of Toronto Press. P. 238.
 7. Cameron A. Dictionary of Old English: A to G Online. 1993. University of Toronto Press. P. 238.
 8. Hogg R. M. The Cambridge History of the English Language: 1992. Volume 1, The Beginnings to 1066. Cambridge University Press. P. 129.
 9. Fromkin V., Rodman N. An Introduction to Language (11th ed.). 2017. Boston: Language learning center. P. 46.
 10. Щербак А.М. Очерки по сравнительной морфологии германских языков. Москва: Наука, 1977. 97 с. (in Russian)
 11. Baudouin de Courtenay J. The Beginnings of Structural Linguistics (E. Stankiewicz, Ed. & Trans.). Bloomington: 1972. Indiana University Press. P. 167.