Lexical-Semantic Analysis of the Terminological System of Agriculture and Water Management

Khaitova Gulshan Bahodirovna

A teacher of German and French languages department Bukhara State University

Annotation: In the period of scientific and technological progress, among the functionally different styles of language, the scientific style acquires great importance. A special form of presentation of a certain set of linguistic means for the transmission of scientific ideas, hypotheses, and discoveries is of extreme interest to linguists. Recently, a large number of works have been devoted to the study of scientific sublanguages, but, nevertheless, the issues of forming the arrangement of the terminological vocabulary of the metalanguage of a number of specific sciences remain unresolved.

Keywords: semantics, styles of language, scientific ideas, hypotheses, linguists, scientific sublanguages, terminological vocabulary.

I. Introduction

The term "semantics" was first introduced in 1897 by M. Breal. Semantic-comparative analysis appeared much later. This research method consists of two stages:

1. the study of the semantics of terms in one language, and then in another;

2. comparison of the semantics of terms in several languages in order to identify similarities and differences.

Semantic-comparative analysis is similar to the deductive method used in logic - from the particular to the general: from the meaning of terms to the general meaning of individual groups of terms and to lexico-semantic categories.

II. Literature review

Semantic-comparative analysis is a system of techniques used to identify the common and the special in the compared languages.

This analysis begins with the simplest - from the study of the nomination process:

a) the formation of terms;

b) the formation of the meanings of terms.

When studying the formation of terms, semantic-comparative analysis relies on the methods of term formation, on the morphological structure of terms, and when studying the formation of term meanings, this analysis uses knowledge from the field of etymology and the history of the language. Then, the features underlying the nomination in the compared languages, that is, the internal form of the terms, are examined. Each object has 5 many signs, and in the name the image of the object is presented only through one sign.

Therefore, in different languages, when forming the meanings of terms in the process of nomination, different attributes of the subject can be taken and, accordingly, the internal form of terms in these languages will be different.

III. Analysis

Semantic-comparative analysis considers terms not as isolated linguistic units, but as a full-fledged part of the general composition of the language. Its main task is to establish the patterns of formation and development of individual terminological systems, to compare the following functions of terms:

c) nominative - naming objects and phenomena of science (the process of nominating terms);

2) communicative - communication. Here, this analysis explores the scope of fixing and realizing the meanings of terms based on context. The term facilitates the process of communication and mutual understanding between specialists in a certain field of knowledge. Semantic-comparative analysis studies not only the direct (terminological), but also figurative determinologized) meaning of terms;

1) heuristic-training. Terms are a tool for mastering a specialty. In order to facilitate the process of their assimilation, this analysis identifies lexico-semantic groups of terms, "thematic" styles of terms with a common meaning.

This brings some order in the study of terms;

2) informational - terms are a source of information and a means of accelerating scientific and technological progress. Semantic-comparative analysis involves the study of lexical-semantic categories and the causes of their occurrence. After all, if the term is polysemic, its information richness increases.

Since the 30s of the XX century, terminology has become an object of study for linguists. The successful development of theoretical problems of terminology contributed to the birth of a new scientific discipline "terminology", designed to formulate the patterns of creation and functioning of terms and term systems.

The founder of Russian scientific terminology is D.S. Lote. He first raised the question of the need for systematization, unification and standardization of terminology based on the theory of the term developed by him. The scientist put forward the thesis about the "ideal term": the term should be unambiguous, precise, short, without synonyms and intra-industry homonyms, and should also be harmonious. He gave his own classification of borrowed terms and deduced some spelling rules for complex terms. His research had a huge impact on the development of domestic scientific terminology.

L.B. Tkachev, in her research, she used computer data processing. L.B. Tkacheva studied various aspects of terminology, but she paid special attention to the role of terms in ensuring scientific and technological progress. She considered in her works the problems associated with the status of onomasion and hypothetical terms. Her view of the term coincided with the point of view of V.P. Danilenko, who argued that "a term is a word in a special function", and this statement, in our opinion, is the most correct.

In modern practical word formation, there has clearly been a tendency to analyze the semantic principle, the purpose of which is to identify word-formation means that serve a certain lexico-semantic category. Since agricultural terms are further SHT represent an array of interconnected vocabulary, united by a common semantic task and differing from each other both in the nature of the designation and in specific word-formation features, conducting the experimental material

through the analysis procedure using the vocabulary block method makes it possible to determine its characteristic semantic specialization of methods and means and terminological nomination. When collecting terms, and 1500 of them were used, special dictionaries were studied. Only those terms were chosen that would confirm the theoretical assumptions in the field of agricultural terminology in the compared languages.

Dictionary compiled by P.A. Adamenko, contains 75,000 terms and term-combinations. It most fully reflects the current state of the Anglo-American terminology of agriculture, so the main part of the terms studied in this work is taken from this dictionary.

The rest of the terms, mostly Russian, were selected from the agricultural dictionary-reference book by A.I. Taister. This dictionary contains about 3000 terms and differs in that the definitions of terms are given in a very short, but quite understandable form.

IV. Discussion

The terminology of agriculture is very large in scope, which to a certain extent complicates the process of its study. Semantic-comparative analysis of agricultural terminology makes it possible to identify the properties and patterns inherent in this field of science, both in Tajik and in English and Russian. Knowledge of these properties and patterns is necessary because it allows you to compare the terminology of agriculture in these languages and determine the course of its development in the future.

Forecasting the development of agricultural terminology will facilitate the process of its study and translation, therefore, knowledge of terminology is necessary for all linguists-translators, as scientists-specialists.

At the end of the study, we came to the following conclusions:

1) The most productive ways of forming agricultural terms in the process of nomination in English and Russian and Tajik languages are morphological and syntactic methods. The most common types of morphological method in English are affixation, conversion and addition, in Russian - affixation and addition.

Abbreviation and conversion in Russian are unproductive. In English there is no non-suffixal way, which is in Russian. The semantic method is more typical for the English language than for Russian. Both in Tajik, English and Russian languages there is a huge number of onomasion terms that are specific to the terminology of agriculture. Borrowing is common in all compared languages. The main source of borrowing in both Tajik, English and Russian is Latin. In the English language, there are almost no borrowed terms from the Russian language.

2) In this work, 700 English, 500 Tajik and 800 Russian agricultural terms were studied, most of which are motivated.

The main group of unmotivated terms is the lexical-semantic group denoting plant species" in Tajik, English and Russian.

3) The features that form the basis of the nomination when forming the meanings of terms can be both the same and different in Tajik, English and Russian languages. But in most cases, the internal form of English terms does not coincide with the similar form of Russian and Tajik terms (70%).

4) 41 lexical - semantic groups of terms in the compared languages are revealed.

The terms of these groups refer mainly to nouns and form, respectively, substantive term combinations, which is the main similarity between the terminology of agriculture in both English and Russian. Adverb terms are rare in all languages, especially in English.

5) The terms of agriculture in both languages have a wide range of compatibility. They are used not only in agricultural literature, but also in fiction.

Agricultural terms as an integral part of the nomination of the reality surrounding a person is one of the most ancient and developed lexical layers. They reflect the natural - geographical environment of human habitation. The material composition of the SHT is characterized by the originality of the various terms functioning in it, which cover more than twenty cardinal terminological groups as the field of agronomy, the floro-faunistic field (plant growing, agriculture, animal husbandry, soil science, sericulture, etc.).

SHT is a vocabulary that explicates a number of specific features of the intrasystem organization, which makes it possible to establish the typology of its meaningful, formal, paradigmatic and syntagmatic features.

The semantic-structural analysis of the SHT showed that the correlation of terms with the system of agricultural concepts correlates with three types of their word-formation correlation: a) with the lexical system of the Tajik language; b) with the lexical system of classical languages (Greek and Latin); with borrowed words from Russian and Arabic.

Language analysis is built according to the scheme of phased deployment from structure to semantics, from the synthesis of the structural characteristics of units in terms of expression to the volume of modeling the plan of the content of the studied material (composition of the SHT).

V. Conclusion

Such word-formation models are chosen, through the prism of which the structural organization of the plan of expression of the SHT is studied. This is an affixal model, a word formation model, the formation of compound words, i.e. multi-root terms of agriculture, the model of composite SHT - verbose terms. The model of affixation, especially suffixation, and the model of compound word formation, characteristic of the language of the analytical system, are most significant for terminological education.

The semantic organization of the entire composition of the SHT - their content plan is derived through modeling according to the method of isolating thematic blocks - lexical - semantic groups and subgroups, such as agriculture, soil science, crop production, animal husbandry, etc. Typologically characteristic of the special terminology are paradigmatic connections that arise as a result of the manifestation of universal semantic categories - synonymy, variance, antonymy and homonymy.

References:

1. Arakin V.D. Comparative typology of English and Russian languages. -M.: Higher school, 1972.- 370p.

2. Belyaevskaya E.G. Semantics of the word. - M .: Higher school, 1987.-126p.

3. Belchikov Y.A. Internalization of terms - M .: Higher School, 1974.-240p.

4. Wuster E. Introduction to general terminology. M.: Enlightenment, 1989.-416p.

5. Galkin-Fedoruk E.M., Gorshkov K.V. Modern Russian language, - M .: Publishing House of Moscow. un-ta, 1962.- 344p.

6. Zyatkovskaya R.G. Semantics and structure of the word Kalinin: KGU, 1984, - 163p.

7. Kandelaki T.L. Semantics and motivation of terms, - M.: Nauka, 1988. 160 p.

8. Lotte D.S. Education and spelling of three-element scientific and technical terms. - M .: Nauka, 1971, - 184p.

9. Nelyubin L.L. Terminology - M.: Enlightenment, 1989.- 420p.

10. Skorokhodko E.F. Questions of translation of English technical literature. Kiev: Publishing house of Kiev, un-ta, 1963.-91 p.

11. Tkacheva L.B. Terminological support of scientific and technical progress. - Omsk, State Publishing House. un-ta, 1987. - 198 p.

12. Shterngerts B.M. Term formation M.: Higher school, 1962.- 412p.

13. Baranov P. A. Farming and agricultural crops - M.: Nauka, 1980.-340p.

14. 35. Merkulova V. A. Essays on Russian folk plant nomenclature. Herbs. Mushrooms. Berries. M.: Nauka, 1967.- 259p.

15. Mukhiddinov I. Features of the traditional agricultural economy of the Pamir peoples in the 19th - early 20th centuries. Dushanbe: Donish, 1984.-194p.

16. Pantielev Y.Kh. ABC vegetable grower.- M .: Kolos, 1992.- 383p.

17. Cherepakhin V.I. Fruit growing. M.: Agropromizdat., 1991.- 271p.

18. Mitchell M. Gone with the Wind Tashkent: Aurika, 1994.- 604p. 2. Plavky 3. Spanish realistic prose - M .: Publishing house "Art. literature", 1976.-655p.

19. Sholokhov M.A. Upturned virgin soil - M .: Publishing house "Art. literature", 1986.- 659p.

20. Hemingway E. For whom the bell tolls- Gr.Br.: Arrow, 1994.- 505 p.

21. Mitchell M. Gone with the wind- Gr. Br.: Mackays of Chatham pic, 1988 1011 P.4.

22. Krindach P.P., Redkina G.A. Grammar guide and dictionary of agricultural terms - M .: Education, 1969.- 70p.

23. Ozhegov S.I. Dictionary of the Russian language - M .: Russian language., 1987.- 797p.

24. Rosenbaum A.N. English-Russian Dictionary of Agricultural Engineering-M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1965.- 379p.