EXCELLENCIA
INTERNATIONAL MULTI-DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF EDUCATION
Volume 4, Issue 9 , 2006 ISSN (E): 2994-9521

LINGUISTIC FEATURES AND CLASSIFICATION CRITERIA OF INTERTERMINOLOGICAL SEMANTIC RELATIONS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE

Jo‘raqulova Mushtariy Abdumalik qizi
Press Secretary, Silk Road University of Innovations

Abstract:

Abstract: This article analyzes the linguistic features of interterminological semantic relations in Uzbek and English scientific discourse and the criteria for their classification. The author examines the principal types of interterminological relations, namely synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, hyperonymy, meronymy, polysemy, and homonymy. The article elucidates how these relations are manifested in scientific texts in Uzbek and English, their language-specific features, and the differences in their classification. In addition, the methodological foundations for identifying interterminological semantic relations are discussed, including such approaches as corpus analysis and componential analysis. The similarities and differences in the structure of the terminological systems of Uzbek and English are illustrated with examples. The author proposes refined criteria for the classification of interterminological relations.

Keywords: term, semantic relation, scientific discourse, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, classification criteria, the Uzbek language, the English language.

Introduction. The terminological system of any language is a complex structure composed of interrelated units. These units do not exist independently of one another; on the contrary, various semantic relations arise between them. [1] The study of interterminological semantic relations is of great importance for understanding the internal regularities of terminology, for organizing terminological systems, and for the correct comprehension of scientific texts. A comparative study of Uzbek and English, in particular, yields valuable results in this field.

The relevance of the topic lies in the fact that Uzbek scientific discourse is currently developing rapidly: new terms are emerging, and existing terminological systems are being refined. [2] In this process, the accurate classification and regulation of interterminological relations ensures the stability of national terminology. English scientific discourse, in turn, occupies a leading position internationally; therefore, a comparative analysis of the two languages serves to bring Uzbek terminology closer to international standards.

The aim of this study is to identify the linguistic features of interterminological semantic relations in Uzbek and English scientific discourse and to develop criteria for their classification. The objectives of the study include: identifying the principal types of interterminological relations; comparing their manifestations in Uzbek and English; defining classification criteria; analyzing existing approaches; and proposing a refined classification. [3]

The object of the study is the terms of scientific discourse in Uzbek and English, while its subject is the semantic relations between them and the criteria for their classification. The article employs the methods of systemic analysis, comparative study, componential analysis, and corpus analysis.

Literature Review. The issue of interterminological semantic relations has long been studied in linguistics. Early research focused mainly on the precision and monosemy of terms, while the relations between them were regarded as a secondary issue. [4] Later, with the development of terminology as a discipline, this issue began to be studied in its own right. Scholars such as V. Danilenko, L. Lotte, and D. Lotte investigated the structure of terminological systems.

In Western linguistics, interterminological relations have been studied by researchers such as J. Sager, S. Wright, and G. Budin. [5] They demonstrated the specific character of synonymy, antonymy, and other relations in terminology. In particular, M. Rogers and others developed various criteria for the classification of terminological systems.

In the CIS region, scholars such as S. Grinyov, V. Leichik, and A. Superanskaya laid the theoretical foundations of terminology. [6] In Uzbekistan, the issue of interterminological relations has been addressed in the works of linguists such as A. Hojiyev, Sh. Shoabdurahmonov, N. Mahmudov, and A. Nurmonov. In recent years, researchers such as H. Ne'matov, B. Yo'ldoshev, and M. Abdurahmonova have been conducting productive work in this field.

However, specialized studies examining interterminological semantic relations in Uzbek and English from a comparative perspective remain insufficient. Existing works have been conducted mainly within the framework of a single language, leaving the issue of cross-linguistic comparison largely unaddressed. For this reason, the present topic is considered relevant.

Research Methodology. The study employed the methods of systemic analysis, comparative study, componential analysis, corpus analysis, and classification. Systemic analysis made it possible to view interterminological relations as an integrated system. Comparative study helped to identify the similarities and differences between these relations in Uzbek and English. Componential analysis made it possible to isolate the semantic components of terms. Corpus analysis, in turn, served to examine the use of terms in authentic texts.

The study was carried out in three stages. At the first stage, the scientific literature was reviewed and the theoretical foundations of interterminological relations were established. At the second stage, terms were selected from scientific texts in Uzbek and English, and the relations between them were analyzed. At the third stage, classification criteria were developed and general conclusions were formulated.

Analysis and Results. The first type of interterminological semantic relation is synonymy. Synonymy is the existence of two or more terms denoting the same or a very similar meaning. [7] Synonymous terms occur more frequently in Uzbek scientific discourse, since both native and borrowed terms are used to express the same concept. Pairs such as *bosim* and *tazyiq* ('pressure'), *kuch* and *quvvat* ('force; power') serve as examples. In English, by contrast, synonymy is less common, since its terminology is rigorously standardized.

The second type is antonymy. Antonymy is the relation between terms with opposite meanings. [8] This phenomenon is widespread in both Uzbek and English, as in such pairs as 'hot' – 'cold', 'large' – 'small', and 'upper' – 'lower'. In scientific discourse, antonymic relations are frequently employed in comparative analyses.

The third type is hyponymy and hyperonymy. Hyponymy is the relation of subordination of a specific concept to a general one. [9] For example, the word 'apple' is a hyponym of the word 'fruit', while 'fruit' is the hyperonym of 'apple'. In English, this relation has a clear hierarchical structure, whereas in Uzbek a certain degree of indeterminacy is sometimes observed.

The fourth type is meronymy. Meronymy is the relation between a part and a whole. [10] For example, 'heart' is a meronym of 'organism', and 'wheel' is a meronym of 'automobile'. This relation is likewise widespread in both Uzbek and English.

The fifth type is polysemy. Polysemy is the capacity of a single term to have several meanings. [11] Polysemy is more frequent in Uzbek scientific discourse, since many terms have been drawn from the general language and are used differently in various fields. In English, by contrast, terms tend more towards monosemy.

The sixth type is homonymy. Homonymy is the relation between terms that are identical in form but entirely different in meaning. [12] For example, the word 'bank' denotes both a financial institution and the edge of a body of water. This phenomenon occurs in both languages.

In developing the classification criteria, attention was paid to the following aspects. The first criterion is the type of semantic relation; it is based on distinguishing such types as synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy. The second criterion is the degree of systemic interconnection; it determines the position of terms within the terminological system. The third criterion is formal expression; it takes into account the morphological and syntactic features of terms. The fourth criterion is cross-linguistic correspondence; it makes it possible to compare the relations between terms in Uzbek and English. The fifth criterion is the domain of use; it determines the field of science to which terms belong. [13]

A comparison of interterminological relations in Uzbek and English revealed the following differences. First, synonymy and polysemy occur more frequently in Uzbek, whereas these phenomena are less common in English. Second, terminological systems in English are considerably more rigorously standardized, whereas in Uzbek this process is still ongoing. Third, the relations between native and borrowed terms in Uzbek are complex, whereas in English this problem is virtually absent. Fourth, interterminological relations in English have a predominantly hierarchical structure, whereas in Uzbek this structure has not yet been fully formed.

Conclusion and Recommendations. Interterminological semantic relations in Uzbek and English scientific discourse constitute a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. Their principal types are synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, hyperonymy, meronymy, polysemy, and homonymy. These relations exist in both languages; however, their manifestation and distribution differ.

Classification criteria should be based on such aspects as the type of semantic relation, the degree of systemic interconnection, formal expression, cross-linguistic correspondence, and the domain of use. These criteria enable a precise and consistent classification of interterminological relations.

Among the pressing tasks for the future are the standardization of Uzbek terminology, the regulation of synonymous and polysemous terms, the creation of electronic dictionaries of interterminological relations, and the development of Uzbek–English parallel corpora.

References

1. Jo‘rayev N.Q. Terminologiya asoslari [Fundamentals of Terminology] // Monograph. – Tashkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2022. – P. 85–102.
2. Xodjayev B.T. Ilmiy diskurs va terminlar [Scientific Discourse and Terms] // Textbook. – Tashkent: Iqtisod-Moliya, 2023. – P. 108–125.
3. Nazarov Sh.R. Terminlararo munosabatlar [Interterminological Relations] // Sotsiologik tadqiqotlar jurnali [Journal of Sociological Research]. – 2024. – No. 1. – P. 41–52.
4. Karimov A.A. Semantik munosabatlar tahlili [Analysis of Semantic Relations] // Scientific article. – Tashkent: NUUz Publishing House, 2024. – P. 35–46.
5. Muminov R.T. Terminologik tizimlar [Terminological Systems] // Textbook. – Tashkent: Noshir, 2022. – P. 88–98.
6. Saidov U.S. Sinonimiya va terminologiya [Synonymy and Terminology] // Monograph. – Tashkent: Adolat, 2022. – P. 98–112.
7. Tillyaev Sh.Q. Antonimiya hodisasi [The Phenomenon of Antonymy] // Axborot texnologiyalari va jamiyat [Information Technologies and Society]. – 2023. – No. 3. – P. 58–67.
8. Abdurahmonova D.K. Giponimiya va giperonimiya [Hyponymy and Hyperonymy] // Sotsiologik tadqiqotlar jurnali [Journal of Sociological Research]. – 2024. – No. 1. – P. 52–60.
9. Zokirov E.A. Meronimiya munosabatlari [Meronymic Relations] // Media va kommunikatsiya [Media and Communication]. – Tashkent, 2024. – P. 95–108.
10. Xalikova N.M. Polisemiya va terminologiya [Polysemy and Terminology] // Raqamli iqtisodiyot va innovatsiyalar [Digital Economy and Innovations]. – 2024. – No. 1. – P. 68–79.
11. Azimov M.I. Omonimiya hodisasi [The Phenomenon of Homonymy] // Ijtimoiy tadqiqotlar [Social Research]. – 2024. – No. 2. – P. 52–63.
12. Abdullayeva Z.K. Tasniflash mezonlari [Classification Criteria] // Ijtimoiy himoya jurnali [Journal of Social Protection]. – 2023. – No. 4. – P. 78–89.
13. Hojiyev A. O‘zbek terminologiyasi masalalari [Issues of Uzbek Terminology]. – Tashkent: Fan, 2021. – P. 112–128.
14. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On the Approval of the ‘Digital Uzbekistan – 2030’ Strategy”. – Tashkent, 2020.